National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEVELOPMENT OF A CHRISTIAN LIFESTYLE INVENTORY

BY

DAVID W. STENSLAND

©

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
SPRING, 1991

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Service des thèses canadiennes

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-66737-0

Canadä

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: DAVID W. STENSLAND

TITLE OF THESIS: DEVELOPMENT OF A CHRISTIAN LIFESTYLE INVENTORY

DEGREE: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1991

Permission is hereby granted to the UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Dave W. Stensland

(Student's Signature)

Student's Permanent Address:
RR#1, Site 6, Box 4
Carvel, Alberta
Canada, T0E 0H0

April 19, 1991

If you asked twenty good men today what they thought the highest of the virtues, nineteen of them would reply, Unselfishness. But if you had asked almost any of the great Christians of old, he would have replied, Love. (C. S. Lewis, 1965, p. 3)

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled DEVELOPMENT OF A CHRISTIAN LIFESTYLE INVENTORY submitted by David W. Stensland in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor Of Philosophy in Counseling Psychology.

William J. Hague
William J. Hague, Ph. D.
Supervisor

Lyle E. Larson
Lyle E. Larson, Ph. D.

Harvey W. Zingle, Ph. D.

Peter Calder
Peter Calder, Ph. D.

David O. Moberg, Ph. D.

March 28, 1991

To

Glen Carlson

Pastor and Friend

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to develop a Christian Lifestyle Inventory, designed to measure the extent to which christian values influence the lifestyles of people. The nine specific values identified as the "Fruit of the Spirit" utilized in this scale are: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. This research derived its definitions of these values from an exegetical analysis of scripture and utilized standard scaling procedures in developing the inventory.

Variance resulting from general social desirability sources was considered by the utilization of a social desirability subscale and for religious desirability sources by the elimination of religious sounding terminology in the test items. The items were tested for item-subscale congruence by an expert panel of 12 ordained pastors. The remaining 180 items were tested on a sample of 686 adult subjects through 50 churches from nine different christian traditions spanning the conservative-liberal orientations in protestant and catholic contexts.

Subscale relatedness and internal consistency were satisfactory. Factor analysis yielded eight factors out of the nine subscales. The scale was sensitive enough to demonstrate significant differences between groups of subjects for age, sex, education, marital and family status, occupational status, income levels, church group affiliation, and frequency of church attendance.

Two external instruments were utilized. The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale yielded a differential denominational correlation coefficient and *Insight*, which is a broad based values inventory, yielded a low correlation coefficient with the Christian Lifestyle Inventory.

It was concluded that: (a) the scale yielded satisfactory evidence of construct validity and internal consistency, (b) the social desirability subscale failed to demonstrate adequate validity or reliability, (c) a commitment to church doctrine and practice was not found to be strongly related to living a christian lifestyle and (d) the relatedness of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory to a broad based inventory of values was minimal. Suggestions for future research included specific recommendations designed to strengthen the scale itself, recommendations related to further validation efforts, and a recognition of the need for further research to clarify the relationship between commitment to church doctrine and practice and commitment to christian lifestyle.

Acknowledgements

The imprint of many can be found within the pages of this thesis.

I want to thank Dr. Peter Calder, who took the time to draw the idea for this research out of me, and Dr. David O. Moberg who graciously pointed me in helpful directions at the early preliminary stages of this work. Dr. Lyle Larson has been consistently available to discuss the detail of the work and helped me strive for excellence. Dr. Harvey Zingle candidly encouraged the idea for this research and provided helpful suggestions that strengthened the project measurably. I am particularly grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Bill Hague, who enlarged my perspective which is not only reflected in the undergirding of this research, but has also been incorporated into my own view of life. I also want to thank Dr. John Paterson, who encouraged me to enter the doctoral program, and guided my initial academic program.

I want to express my appreciation to my colleagues at Cornerstone Counselling Centre, particularly the Executive Director, Dr. Ray Seutter, and Lander Liddel, Ross Olson, and Doug Spinney, who were with me from the beginning of the project.

The greatest thanks goes to my family, who not only had to tolerate my absence from their daily life but also

sacrificed their own preferences in favor of Dad's studies. My wife, Sandy, who had her own personal stresses during this time, also imprinted this research with her ideas and together with Dan, Mike, Tammy and Chris celebrate the completion of this project with me. I thank them deeply for their support.

This research was partially supported by grants from the Chancery Office of the Catholic Archdiocese of Edmonton and the Office of the Bishop for the Synod of Alberta and the Territories of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada.

Table Of Contents

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 5

Value Theories 5

Theory of Action 5

Theory of Organization and Change 10

Deficiency-Values and Being-Values . . . 15

Values Clarification 19

Genesis Effect 22

Human Excellence: A Question of Virtues . . . 27

Aristotle's Ethics 27

St. Thomas Aquinas' Philosophy 33

Virtues and Values 38

Virtues or Values 39

Definitions of Christian Values 40

Love 43

Analysis 43

Definition 48

Joy 49

Analysis 49

Definition 51

Peace 52

Analysis 52

Definition 54

Patience 55

Analysis 55

Definition 57

Kindness 57

Analysis 57

Definition 59

Goodness 59

Analysis 59

Definition 61

Faithfulness 61

Analysis 61

Definition 63

Gentleness 63

Analysis 63

Definition 66

Self-Control 66

Analysis 66

Definition 68

Religiosity Scales 69

Earlier Conceptions 69

Recent Scales 71

Existential/Spiritual Well-Being Scale 71

Spiritual Maturity Index 72

Shepherd Scale 72
The Spiritual Leadership Qualities Inventory 72
Spiritual Well-Being Scale 73
Religious Status Interview 74
Comparison Of Several Scales 75
Christian Values Scales 78
Preliminary Christian Lifestyle Scale 78
Maloney's Life Style Inventory . . . 79
Unique Characteristics 81
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURES 83
Construct Validation 83
Substantive component 85
Item Development 85
Item situation bias 86
Item endorsement bias 87
Desirability subscale 88
Infrequency subscale eliminated 89
Item-Subscale Congruence 89
Experimental Edition 90
Sample Selection 91
Subject incentive 93
Item Analysis 93
Structural component 95
Statistical Analysis 96

External Component 96
Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale 97
Insight 97
Comparison Of Group Differences 98
Limitations and Implications 99
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 103
Substantive Component 103
Item-Subscale Congruence 104
Subject Participation Information 106
Church Participation Rates 106
Subject Return Rates 108
Sample Description 109
Denomination distribution . . . 109
Age distribution 110
Sex distribution 111
Marital status 111
Occupations 111
Income levels 111
Church attendance 112
Education 112
Empirical Basis For Item Selection . . . 114
Initial Considerations 114
Desirability concerns 114
Low information value items . . 116
Item Selection 116

Structural Component 120
Internal Consistency 120
Subscale Relatedness 121
Mutuality Of Subscales 121
Independence Of Subscales 122
Factor Analysis 123
Means And Standard Deviations . . . 125
External Component 126
Relatedness To Other Instruments 126
Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale 126
Insight 131
Comparison of Group Differences 133
Sex Differences 133
Age Differences 135
Educational Differences 137
Marital Status Differences 138
Family Status Differences 141
Income Level Differences 142
Occupational Differences 143
Church Denominational Differences . 145
Church Attendance Differences . . . 147
Summary 149
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 155
Conclusions 155
Conclusion One 155

Conclusion Two 159

Conclusion Three 159

Conclusion Four 161

Implications 161

Recommendations 168

References 171

APPENDIX A: List Of Initial Items And Results of Item-Objective Congruence Judgements . 177

APPENDIX B: Letter To Expert Judges Panel 209

APPENDIX C: Christian Lifestyle Inventory Items . . 212

APPENDIX D: Letter to Church Leaders 256

APPENDIX E: Letter to Pastors 259

APPENDIX F: Instructions for Subjects Receiving Standard Questionnaire Package 262

APPENDIX G: Instructions for Subjects Receiving Extra Questionnaire Package 264

APPENDIX H: *Insight* Items 267

APPENDIX I: Tables 280

List Of Tables

Table

A-1 Randomized Initial Items By Category 178

A-2 Results of Item-Objective Congruence Judgements by Pastors to Randomly Presented Items 197

C-1 Christian Lifestyle Inventory: Experimental Questionnaire Edition 213

C-2 Experimental Items Listed by Category 223

C-3 Christian Lifestyle Inventory Final Items 238

1 Distribution Of Expert Pastor Judges By Denomination 281

2 Expert Item Judgement Agreement With Item Key 282

3 Church Participation Rates By Denomination . . 283

4 Subject Return Rates By Denomination 284

5 Subject Distribution By Denomination 285

6 Age distribution By Denomination 286

7 Percent of Sex Distribution By Denomination . 287

8 Percent of Marital Status Distribution By Denomination 288

9 Percent of Occupational Status Distribution By Denomination 289

10 Percent of Income Distribution By Denomination 290

11 Frequency of Monthly Church Attendance By Denomination 291

12 Percent of Education Completed By Denomination 292

13 Communality Values For Desirability Subscale . 293

14 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Final Items And The Subscales . . 294

15 Alpha Levels For Christian Lifestyle Inventory Subscales and Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale 298

16 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Subscales 299

17 Principal Components-Oblimin Rotation Factor Correlation Matrix 300

18 Principal Components Varimax Rotation Factor Loadings 301

19 Mean Scores And Standard Deviations On The Christian Lifestyle Inventory 305

20 Mean Score Differences On Faithfulness Subscale By Sex 306

21 Mean Score Differences On Gentleness Subscale By Sex 306

22 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Sex 307

23 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Sex 307

24 Mean Score Differences On Kindness Subscale By Sex 308

25 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Age 309

26 Mean Score Differences On Self-Control Subscale By Age 309

27 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Age 310

28 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Age 310

29 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Age . 311

30 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Education 312

31 Mean Score Differences On Faithfulness Subscale By Education 312

32 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Education 313

33 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Education 313

34 Mean Score Differences On Gentleness Subscale By Marital Status 314

35 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Marital Status 314

36 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Marital Status 315

37 Mean Score Differences On Self-Control Subscale By Marital Status 315

38 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Marital Status 316

39 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Marital Status 316

40 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Marital Status 317

41 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Family Status 318

42 Mean Score Differences On Faithfulness Subscale By Family Status 318

43 Mean Score Differences On Gentleness Subscale By Family Status 319

44 Mean Score Differences On Self-Control Subscale By Family Status 319

45 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Family Status 320

46 Mean Score Differences On Peace subscale By Family Status 320

47 Mean Score Differences On Kindness Subscale By Family Status 321

48 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Family Status 321

49 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Gross Annual Income 322

50 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Gross Annual Income 322

51 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Gross Annual Income 323

52 Mean Score Differences On Self-Control Subscale By Occupational Group 324

53 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Occupational Group 325

54 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Occupational Group 326

55 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Occupational Group 327

56 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Occupational Group 328

57 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Denomination 329

58 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Denomination 330

59 Mean Score Differences On Gentleness Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance 331

60 Mean Score Differences On Patience Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance 331

61 Mean Score Differences On Kindness Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance 332

62 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance 332

63 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance 333

64 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Frequency Of Church Attendance 333

65 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Christian Lifestyle Inventory and The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale . . . 334

66 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Christian Lifestyle Inventory and The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale By Denomination 335

67 Mean Score Differences On The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale By Denomination . . 336

68 Mean Score Differences On The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale By Frequency Of Monthly Church Attendance 337

69 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Christian Lifestyle Inventory And Insight 338

70 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Christian Lifestyle Inventory and *Insight* By Denomination 339

71 Mean Score Differences On *Insight* By Education 340

72 Mean Score Differences On *Insight* By Occupational Group 341

I. INTRODUCTION

This research follows a tradition of study on the relationship between values people ascribe to and their choices of behavior and styles of daily life. This project will limit its boundaries to religious values, and in particular, christian religious values. As such, this is a study of lifestyle from a Christian point of view. The framework for that point of view is the "Fruit of the Spirit" recorded in the Bible in Galatians 5: 22,23.

The primary emphasis of this study will be on the development of a Christian Lifestyle Inventory, designed to measure the extent that christian values influence the lifestyles of people. The nine specific values identified as "Fruit of the Spirit" to be included in this inventory are: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. It is the intent of this research to define each of these values based on exegetical study of Scripture and to utilize standard scaling procedures in developing the inventory.

Many religiosity scales have been developed over the years ranging from very simple one or two item indicators to highly complex multi-level scales including two and three hundred item scales and indepth interviews (Bassett, Sadler, Kobischen, Skiff, Merrill, Atwater & Livermore, 1981; Silverman, 1983; Moberg, 1979; Spilka, Hood & Gorsuch, 1985). Most scales are designed to measure one of two basic questions: How religious is this person, or How is this person religious? What seems to be lacking in the armament of christian religiosity scales is one that combines both questions and does so in a context that is trans-denominational.

Such a scale may not only provide a research tool for exploring similarities and differences between a variety of groups, including church attenders and non-attenders, but also between different denominations of church attenders. This tool may also be valuable in understanding differences between various congregations within denominations, and perhaps serve as a valuable tool in helping to match up specific clergy with compatible congregations or parishes by comparing group profiles with individual clergy profiles. Such a tool may be useful at an individual level, either in the diagnostic context of pastoral counselling with individuals or couples, or spiritual directing, or perhaps in the selection of church leaders. Finally, such a tool may be very useful in measuring change over time for individuals and groups.

One of the advantages of such an inventory may be that its values based lifestyle framework might provide a measure that overarches other theoretical conceptions while remaining compatible with them. Kluckhohn (1951) referred to the Cornell value-study group who observed that the concept "value" provides a point of convergence for the various specialized social sciences. They described value as a "bridging concept which can link together many diverse specialized studies" (p. 389). In this particular case, for example, it is anticipated that this scale will be compatible with Fowler's Stages of Faith (Fowler, 1981) and also with Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development (Kohlberg, 1980). Similarly, this inventory is expected to be compatible with the cognitive developmental perspective and that of the existential-phenomenological context in which developmental aspects are accommodated.

Within the context of religiosity measures, the Christian Lifestyle Inventory is unique in several aspects. First, its focus is on lifestyle rather than on doctrine, or traditions of the institutionalized church. Secondly, the values upon which the scale is constructed are derived from exegetical analysis of Scripture, insuring, as much as possible, that the definitions reflect biblical conceptions rather than institutional practices. The items, however, are devoid of religious terminology. Thirdly, this scale is designed for use with a broad range of people, rather than for church attenders only or "Christians" only. As such, it has a wide range of application. Finally, its overarching theoretical framework provides a tool that is compatible with a variety of theoretical models and may provide another mechanism to help bridge the gap between a variety of theorists and disciplines all looking for ways of understanding the many roads to mature healthy living.

The review of literature which follows begins with a section covering pertinent value theories and their relationship to the traditional historical conception of virtues, followed by a detailed exegetical analysis of the scriptural definitions of the nine christian values that form the basis of this Christian Lifestyle Inventory, and concludes with a review of relevant religiosity scales.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Value Theories

This first section in the review of the literature explores several of the value theories that appear relevant to the topic of this research. Those theories include (1) Kluckhohn's (1951) Theory of Action, (2) Rokeach's (1968) Theory of Organization and Change, Maslow's (1968) Deficiency-Values and Being-Values, the Values Clarification approach of Raths, Harmon and Simon (1966, 1978), and Hall's (1986) Genesis Effect.

Theory of Action

One of the value theories that may be applicable to this study is that put forth by Kluckhohn (1951) in which he attempts to define values and value orientations within the context of a theory of action. The significance of this framework is that it places paramount emphasis on the action outcome. In order to understand the implications of the definitions of value and value orientations, then, it is prerequisite that a clear understanding of what is meant by the term "action" is established. Parsons and Shils (1951) describe the Theory of Action as "a conceptual scheme for the analysis of the behavior of living organisms" (p. 53). When this behavior is conceptualized to be oriented to the attainment of ends, takes place in situations, is normatively regulated, and involves the expenditure of energy, effort, or motivation; it is referred to as "action". The Theory of Action is not so interested

> ". . . in the physiological processes internal to the organism but rather to the organization of the actor's orientations to a situation. . . . Action has an orientation when it is guided by the meaning which the actor attaches to it in its relationship to his goals and interests" (p. 5).

Kluckhohn (1951) leaves little doubt about the inextricable tie he places between the values people acquire and the culture in which they live. At the outset of his chapter he states:

> "Human life is - and has to be - a moral life precisely because it is a social life. . . . morals are socially agreed upon values relating to conduct. To this degree morals - and all group values - are the products of social interaction as embodied in culture" (p. 388).

Kluckhohn also recognizes, however, something called "conscience" from a biological basis which he refers to as a source of idiosyncratic values that allow individual differences and also explain values that change and new ones that are invented.

Values are observed in ideas, expressional symbols and in the moral and aesthetic norms evident in behavioral regularities. A value implies a code or a standard which has some persistence through time, one which organizes a system of action. As such, values place things, acts, way of behaving, and goals of action on the "approval - disapproval continuum" (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 395). Both cognitive and cathectic elements are always present in values, though the primacy of one over the other varies with the context. Kluckhohn sees the role of values as having an integrative function for cognitive and cathectic elements in human behavior. He states, "values synthesize cognitive and cathectic elements in orientations to an object world - that is, a social relationship system" (p. 394).

Kluckhohn defines a value as a "conceptual, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action" (1951, p. 395). Values formulate action commitments. They are not just preferences which are felt or considered to be justified, but carry the undertone of the desirable. The desirable is what is felt or thought proper to want; it is what people "want and believe they ought or should desire" (p. 396). Kluckhohn describes values as something people can identify through words. In fact, "verbalizability is", in his view, "a necessary test of value" (p. 397) in order to separate values from instinctive behavior and needs which are below the level of abstraction and not directly in the content of value. Even the implicit aspect of value should have a limited verbal component.

Although Kluckhohn understands values to be cultural products, each group value is given a private interpretation and meaning by the individual - "sometimes to the extent that the value becomes personally distinctive" (p. 398). He refers to the Cornell study-group that stated:

> Some values are directly involved in the individual's existence as a "self". . . . Values act as components of super ego or ego-ideal, they are constitutive of the person's sense of identity; if violated, there is guilt, shame, ego deflation, intropunitive reaction (p. 398).

It is in this context, perhaps, that it is clearer how affect is always involved in value. Cathexis and value are inevitably interrelated but seldom coincide completely because cathexis is impulsive, a short-term and narrower response; value implies a broader and long term view.

The influence of value upon selective behavior is always related to an element of consistency and congruency. Values add a flavor of predicability to social life. People establish track records of dependability because of the values. Kluckhohn (1951) is quite clear, however, about the limitation of inferring values from isolated events rather than looking at patterns or trends in behavior. He states, "sometimes what a person says about his values is truer from a long-term viewpoint than inferences drawn from his actions under special conditions" (p. 406).

Beyond these patterns or trends in behavior which reflect values, Kluckhohn (1951) sees a broader conception of values: "There is a 'philosophy' behind the way of life of every individual and of every relatively homogeneous group at any given point in their histories (p. 409). He quotes Gregory Bateson who said:

> The human individual is endlessly simplifying, organizing, and generalizing his own view of his own environment; he constantly imposes on this environment his own constructions and meanings; these constructions and meanings are characteristic of one culture, as over against another. (p. 409)

For those value notions that embrace both value and existential elements, that are both general and organized, Kluckhohn uses the term "value orientations". He defines a value orientation as "a generalized and organized conception, influencing behavior, of nature, of man's place in it, of man's relation to man, and of the desirable and nondesirable as they may relate to man-environment and interhuman relations" (1951, p. 411). This definition suggests that value elements and existential premises are almost inextricably blended in the overall picture that characterizes an individual or group. It symbolizes the fact that affective-cognitive (value) and strictly cognitive (orientation) elements are blended.

The salient aspects of this theoretical framework, pertinent to this study, are that the values emerge and operate within a cultural-social context; values influence the selection of behaviors on the basis of what is deemed to be desirable; that this selection is observed in patterns or trends in behavior rather than in any one isolated event; that "conscience" is a source of idiosyncratic values that allow individual differences and explain values that change and new ones that are invented; that values are abstractions that reflect a conscious awareness that at least to some extent can be verbally acknowledged; that affect and cognition are both represented in a value; and that values are inextricably related to one's world view or perception of self in relationship to others and one's world.

Theory of Organization and Change

Milton Rokeach (1968) is one of the most well known people to develop a values-based conception of human functioning. His theory of organization and change was structured to reflect a total belief-attitude-value system. Accordingly, Rokeach defined a belief as any simple proposition, conscious or unconscious, inferred from what a person says or does, capable of being preceded by the phrase, "I believe that . . .," and serves the function of predispositions to action.

He conceived of five types of beliefs falling along a central-peripheral dimension of connectedness. The more a given belief is functionally connected or in communication with other beliefs, the more implications and consequences it has for other beliefs, and therefore is more central and important for the individual. These five types of beliefs include: Type A, Primitive Beliefs with 100 percent consensus, (I believe this is a chair, I believe my name is _______); Type B, Primitive Beliefs with zero consensus, ("I believe in God", I believe I am a good person", I believe my mother doesn't love me".) Type C, Authority Beliefs which represent the beginning of nonprimitive beliefs. It raises the question for the individual of which authorities could know and also which authorities would know. Any given authority belief is controvertible because the individual has learned that some reference groups do not share one's beliefs. Nonprimitive beliefs develop out of Type A beliefs and are functionally connected to them. "They seem to serve the purpose of helping the person sound out his picture of the world, realistically and rationally to the extent possible, defensively and irrationally to the extent necessary" (Rokeach, 1968, p. 9). Type D, Derived Beliefs are ideological beliefs originating with political or religious institutions, and derived second hand through processes of identification with authority rather than by direct contact. These beliefs are psychologically controvertible, similar to Type C beliefs because they are not shared by everyone. Type E, Inconsequential Beliefs represent more or less arbitrary matters of taste and have few functional connections with other beliefs. Rokeach described this total belief system as an ". . .

organization of beliefs varying in depth, formed as a result of living in nature and society, designed to help a person maintain, insofar as possible, a sense of ego and group identity, stable and continuous over time" (Rokeach, 1968, pp.11-12).

Rokeach defined an attitude as "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner" (1968, p. 113). He identified each belief within an attitude organization as having a cognitive, affective, and behavioral component leading to some action when suitably activated.

While an attitude, according to Rokeach (1968), represents several beliefs focused on a specific object or situation, a value is a single belief that transcendently guides actions and judgements across specific objects or situations, and beyond immediate goals to more ultimate end-states of existence. Moreover, while an attitude predisposes one to respond in a preferential manner, a value is an imperative to action and serves as a standard to guide actions, attitudes, comparisons, evaluations, and justifications of self and others.

An attitude reflects a package of beliefs consisting of interconnected assertions to the effect that certain things about a specific object or situation are true or false, and other things about it are desirable or undesirable. Values, in contrast, have to do with modes of conduct and end-states of existence. Rokeach defines a value as:

> An enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternate ones. Once a value is internalized, it becomes, consciously or unconsciously, a standard or criterion for guiding action, for developing and maintaining attitudes toward specific objects and situations, for justifying one's own and others' actions and attitudes, for morally judging self and others, and for comparing self with others. Finally, a value is a standard employed to influence the values, attitudes and actions of at least some others - our children's, for example (Rokeach, 1968, pp. 159-160).

Values were conceived to be of two kinds, distinguished on the basis of means and ends, which Rokeach referred to as instrumental values and terminal values. He conceived these values to be organized into hierarchial structures and substructures. Collectively, they reflect a value system with specific values rank ordered along a continuum of importance. Instrumental and terminal values represent two value systems, each functionally connected with the other, and both systems connected with many attitudes toward specific objects or situations.

Often a person is confronted with a situation which may activate two or more values in conflict with one another. For example, having to choose between behaving compassionately or competently, or truthfully, or patriotically. According to Rokeach (1968), a person's value system represents a learned organization of rules for making choices and resolving conflicts between two or more modes of behavior or between two or more end-states of existence. In that sense, values serve the function of guiding choices that promote or confirm one's reality based on their total belief-attitude-value system.

In summary, Rokeach (1968) conceived individuals to have thousands of beliefs that bundle together into hundreds of attitudes which, in turn, bundle together into less than 100 instrumental and terminal values. He envisioned this belief-attitude-value-system to include cognitive, affective, and behavioral components that resulted in choices of actions that reflected one's perception of reality. While the theoretical conception clearly seems to highlight an action oriented perspective, Rokeach's way of measuring value hierarchies of individuals was for them to rank order their own perceived values, from a standard list of values, which may or may not have a direct correlation with their behavior in real life situations. It is apparent that other value orientations must also be considered in the search for a suitable theoretical framework applicable for the Christian Lifestyle Inventory.

Deficiency-Values and Being-Values

In the 1960's Abraham Maslow put forth his thinking on the values contributing to healthy human living in his book, *Toward A Psychology Of Being* (1968). He described these values as serving the function of both needs and motivators in people's lives. His basic premise was that humans naturally pursue that which is good for them by freely choosing it, providing the environment is able to meet the primary needs for food and shelter, safety, love, and self esteem. He called these basic needs Deficiency Values or D-Values which when satisfied on a regular basis allow the person to pursue self-actualization through higher values which he calls Being-Values or B-Values.

He conceptualizes D-Values as universal and basic, whereas B-Values are more idiosyncratic in the sense that there are a variety of ways in which they are lived out. Furthermore, he places these values within a hierarchial structure with the most basic needs or values described as the most powerful. The higher B-Values are weaker and can be pursued only when the more compelling D-Values are satisfied on a regular basis. Maslow points out that there is a remarkable difference between the person whose need for love as a basic need (D-Love) which is designed to fill up the emptiness inside and the self-actualizing healthy person's need for love (B-Love):

> The healthy person, not having this deficiency, does not need to receive love except in steady, small, maintenance doses and he may even do without these for periods of time. . . . clinical study of healthier people who have been love-need-satiated, show that although they need less to receive love, they are more able to give love. In this sense they are more loving people. (1968, p. 42)

Maslow makes a strong departure from the traditional conception of virtues that are externally determined and taught when he discusses the role of the environment. He describes humans as having a natural pressure within them pushing them toward fuller and fuller humanness, actualization, or Being, much like an acorn pressing toward being an oak tree. The seeds of what they are meant to become are derived from within:

> Man is ultimately not molded or shaped into humanness, or taught to be human. The role of the environment is ultimately to permit him or help him to actualize *his own* potentialities, not *its* potentialities. The environment does not give him potentialities and capacities; he *has* them in inchoate or embryonic form, just exactly as he has embryonic arms and legs. . . . It doesn't implant within him the ability to love, or to be curious, or to philosophize, or to symbolize, or to be creative. Rather it permits, or fosters, or encourages or helps what exists in embryo to become real and actual. (1968, pp. 160-161)

While Maslow described this forward growth movement as something rather steady and consistent (when the environment is conducive), he also recognized a very real and necessary regressive component: "In addition to the pressures forward to health, there are also fearful-regressive pressures backward toward sickness and weakness" (1968, p. 164). It is this potential for weakness and sickness that lies at the base of the evil side of humans. Maslow's solution to such evil potential is to recognize it as a legitimate aspect of all humans, via "self-knowledge", allowing temporary "healthy regression" to satisfy more basic needs in order to move forward again. To fail to acknowledge one's potential for sickness, one's fear of moving forward, is to thwart one's potential to realize a healthy self-actualizing life, or as Maslow put it: "Only by fully appreciating this dialectic between sickness and health can we help to tip the balance in favor of health" (1968, p. 166). Furthermore, Maslow sees the tipping of this balance to be the result of good choosing, and that healthy, more mature, self-actualizing persons are better choosers than less healthy persons. Always, when Maslow talks about good choosing, he places it in the context of an environment or good situation that truly allows for free choice; one that is nurturing and consistently meeting the basic needs of individuals.

Finally, Maslow places these B-Values in the context of "higher values" or" eternal virtues" that come from within rather than something imposed externally, and clarifies that they are best discovered in healthy people:

> . . . the so-called higher values, the eternal values, etc., etc., etc., are approximately what we find as the free choices in the good situation, of those people whom we call relatively healthy

> (mature, evolved, self-fulfilled, individuated, etc.), when they are feeling at their best and strongest. (1968, p. 168)

In order to identify those values which healthy persons chose, it is necessary to identify the characteristics of healthy people which Maslow listed as:

1. Clearer, more efficient perception of reality.
2. More openness to experience.
3. Increased integration, wholeness, and unity of the person.
4. Increased spontaneity, expressiveness; full functioning; aliveness.
5. A real self; a firm identity; autonomy, uniqueness.
6. Increased objectivity, detachment, transcendence of self.
7. Recovery of creativeness.
8. Ability to fuse concreteness and abstractness.
9. Democratic character structure.
10. Ability to love, etc. (1968, p. 157)

Maslow places a great deal of emphasis on this approach to identifying the higher B-Values because, as he insists, they come from within rather than being imposed from without. It allows him, to his way of thinking, to ask "What are the values of the best human beings?' rather than, 'what should be their values? or, 'What ought they be" (1968, p. 158). It is in this context of having studied these healthy specimens of humans that the following list of B-Values were presented, which he described as overlapping facets of Being:

(1) wholeness; (unity; integration, tendency to one-ness; inter-connectedness; simplicity; organization; structure; dichotomy-transcendence; order);

(2) perfection; (necessity; just-right-ness; just-so-ness; inevitability; suitability; justice; completeness; "oughtness");

> (3) completion; (ending; finality; justice; "its finished"; fulfilment; *finis* and *telos*; destiny; fate);
> (4) justice; (fairness; orderliness; lawfulness; "oughtness");
> (5) aliveness; (process; non-deadness; spontaneity; self-regulation; full-functioning);
> (6) richness; (differentiation, complexity; intricacy);
> (7) simplicity; (honesty; nakedness; essentiality; abstract, essential, skeletal structure);
> (8) beauty; (rightness; form; aliveness; simplicity; richness; wholeness; perfection; completion; uniqueness; honesty);
> (9) goodness; (rightness; desirability; oughtness; justice; benevolence; honesty);
> (10) uniqueness; (idiosyncrasy; individuality; non-comparability; novelty);
> (11) effortlessness; (ease; lack of strain, striving or difficulty; grace; perfect, beautiful functioning);
> (12) playfulness; (fun; joy; amusement; gaiety; humor; exuberance; effortlessness);
> (13) truth; honesty; reality; (nakedness; simplicity; richness; oughtness; beauty; pure, clean and unadulterated; completeness; essentiality);
> (14) self-sufficiency; (autonomy; independence; not-needing-other-than-itself-in-order-to-be-itself; self-determining; environment-transcendence; separateness; living by its own laws). (1968, p. 83)

Values Clarification

Values Clarification was one of the more popular frameworks for understanding values. It was first introduced by Raths, Harmin and Simon in 1966 and refined in their second book twelve years later (1978). The emphasis of this approach is on the process of valuing rather than on the specific values themselves. Few people have a clear picture of what values they do hold or how they came to have them. As a consequence, many people have difficulty "pulling themselves together". Decisions seem too difficult, pressures too widespread and changes too unsettling. Consequently, "some people flounder in confusion, apathy, or inconsistency. . . . They cannot find life patterns for themselves that are purposeful and satisfying" (p.4). The theory of Values Clarification asserts that such people can be helped to clarify their values, and their behavior will change in the direction of less confusion, apathy or inconsistency.

One of the underlying assumptions of this theory is that humans can arrive at clear values by "an intelligent process of choosing, prizing, and behaving" (Raths et al., 1978, p. 9).

According to this theory, values come out of peoples' experiences in life in the form of guides to behavior. Different experiences give rise to different values, which in turn are modified with accumulated experience. "As guides to behavior, values evolve and mature as experiences evolve and mature" (Raths, et al., 1978, p. 26). Values as guides are seen as patterns of evaluating and behaving that tend to develop as a result of repeated persistent "hammering out a style of life in a certain set of surroundings. Certain things are treated as right, desirable, or worthy. These become our values" (p. 26). While these values vary from person to person because of varying experiences, whatever values a person obtains "should work as effectively as possible to relate that person to his or her inner and outer worlds in a satisfying and intelligent way" (p. 26). Here, again, there is an emphasis on the importance values serve as mediators between the inner reality and outer reality of a person's view of themselves in the world.

Raths et al. (1978) define a value as a guide for behavior that meets the following seven criteria:

> Choosing: (1) freely
> (2) from alternatives
> (3) after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative
> Prizing: (4) cherishing, being happy with the choice
> (5) enough to be willing to affirm the choice to others
> Acting: (6) or doing something with the choice
> (7) repeatedly, in some pattern of life. (p. 28)

Here, too, there is a similarity with Kluckhohn's definition of value in that elements of cognition (choosing) affect (prizing), and behavior (acting) are present. One of the significant differences between Kluckhohn (1951), Rokeach (1968), and even Brian Hall (1986) who will be considered in the next section, is the number of values this theoretical framework allows is infinite, whereas Kluckhohn (1951), Rokeach (1968), Maslow (1968) and Hall (1986) all seem to limit values in some way to reflect content that is more basic, or fundamental, or more central in peoples' lives.

Genesis Effect

The values oriented framework that appears most applicable to this project is described most recently by Brian P. Hall (1986) in his book entitled *The Genesis Effect: Personal and Organizational Transformations.* Accordingly, values are seen as the mediators between our inner world of images and the external and observable world of everyday. The "Genesis Effect" is the process through which our internal images act upon and transform the world we live in. The heart of the "Genesis Effect" is how values mediate the internal and external realities through the use of language. Accordingly, language and consciousness are connected. That something, inherent in written and spoken language that can alter our consciousness, is called "values". Certain words in the language are more central and powerful than others and are the values representing the outward signs of an inner reality. Priorizing values or repriorizing values occurs as a consequence of a shift in consciousness which, according to Hall, goes on at a deeper level. Hall states:

> . . . behind each of the values lies a deeper inner reality, an image, often unconscious, of what that value represents. The value, whether in the written language or spoken word, is the tip of the iceberg. Self-Preservation and Self-Worth are prefigured, if you wish, in the unconscious as images of how our inner self views the world of people and things. Hence behind the dialectic there is an inner imaging and reimaging process that is actually reorganizing the person's world view and all his or her

> consequent behavior. The values are simply external indicators of this process. (Hall, 1986, p. 22)

A value is a concept of priority that reflects the internal images and world view of persons and is transported and contained in the products of their work. They are chosen priorities that are frequently acted upon and facilitate or detract from the healthy development of that person. Values are units of information that mediate our inner reality into full expression in our everyday lives. Our internal images of reality, according to Hall, fall into four basic world views. These world views are developmental and related to the aging process, though there is not a natural and necessary movement from one phase to the next. Individuals remain in one phase integrating the values of that stage of maturity, and may not go beyond it.

The four basic world views identified by Hall (1986) were summarized as phases of development as follows:

Phase 1: The world is a MYSTERY over which I have NO CONTROL. Here, the self EXITS at the center of a HOSTILE WORLD. The self struggles to SURVIVE in an ALIEN, OPPRESSIVE, CAPRICIOUS ENVIRONMENT. Here, the self seeks to satisfy the PHYSICAL NEED for FOOD, PLEASURE/SEX, WARMTH and SHELTER. Typical values in this phase include Self-Preservation, Safety-Survival, and Security.

Phase 2: The world is a PROBLEM with which I must COPE. Here, the self does things to succeed and to belong in a SOCIAL WORLD. The self seeks to BELONG in a SIGNIFICANT HUMAN ENVIRONMENT and TO BE APPROVED by other SIGNIFICANT PERSONS. Here, the self seeks to satisfy the SOCIAL NEED for ACCEPTANCE, AFFIRMATION, APPROVAL and ACHIEVEMENT. Typical values in this phase include Family/Belonging, Self-Worth, Self-competence/Confidence, Instrumentality and Education.

Phase 3: The world is a PROJECT in which I must PARTICIPATE. Here, the self ACTS on the CREATED WORLD with conscience and independence. The self strives to RE-SHAPE the NATURAL SOCIAL CULTURAL ENVIRONMENTS with CONSCIENCE and INDEPENDENCE. Here, the self seeks to satisfy the PERSONAL NEED to EXPRESS CREATIVE INSIGHTS, BE ONESELF, DIRECT ONE'S LIFE, and OWN ONE'S IDEAS/ENTERPRISES. Typical values in this phase include Life/Self Actualization, Service/Vocation, Being Self, Human Dignity, Empathy, Health, Independence and Accountability/Mutual Responsibility.

Phase 4: The world is a MYSTERY for which WE must CARE. Here, selves GIVE LIFE to the GLOBAL WORLD. Selves ENLIVEN the GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT through the UNION of INTIMACY and SOLITUDE within and the HARMONY of SYSTEMS without. Here, selves seek to satisfy the COMMUNAL NEED for GLOBAL HARMONY by nurturing persons and communities from their phases of consciousness. Typical values in this phase include Intimacy/Solitude, Ecority/Beauty, Transcendence, Interdependence, Convival Tools/Intermediate technology.

The four phases of human and spiritual development above represent separate world views which are all connected by in-between cycles giving rise to seven distinct cycles of development: (a) Primal, (b) Familial, (c) Institutional, (d) Intra Personal, (e) Communal, (f) Mystical, and (g) Prophetic (Hall, 1986). Specific values have been identified for each of the seven cycles of development. Collectively, there are 125 values which have been reduced to a more manageable list of 50 value clusters. These fifty value clusters form the basis of the Hall-Tonna Inventory of Values (1986) which is used to identify specific value clusters and levels of maturity for individuals, groups, and organizations.

Insight (Hall, 1990) is a more recent values inventory, based on the Hall-Tonna Inventory of values but expanded to utilize all 125 values rather than the 50 value clusters and refined to provide 19 discreet stages of development rather than the seven stages, or "cycles", as they are called in the Hall-Tonna Inventory of Values. The 19 Stages utilized by Insight are as follows: (1) Primal, (2) Security, (3) Familial Security (4) Familial, (5) Familial Identity, (6) Familial Institutional, (7) Institutional, (8) Intra-Institutional, (9) Personal Search, (10) Intra-Personal, (11) Actualization (12) Communal, (13) Communal/Collaborative, (14) Servant, (15) Collaborative Mystical, (16) Mystical, (17) Creation, (18) Prophetic, and (19) Ecority.

Insight appears to be a more useful instrument for research purposes because of its expanded use of all 125 values and more refined outcome reports.

It seems apparent, from a cursory review of the Hall-Tonna values, and their definitions, that the nine christian values providing the content basis of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory (love, joy peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control) likely fall within the middle third and later stages of development.

Human Excellence: A Question of Virtues

"When we talk about human values we are at some level always assuming something about the quality of a person's life, or human excellence" (Hall, in press, p. 4). The question of human excellence has been around for along time. Socrates and Aristotle discussed it at length in the third and fourth centuries, B.C.

Aristotle's Ethics

Aristotle discussed virtue in the context of pursuing that which is the ultimate good for people. He referred to the *supreme good* as *something final* by which he meant that which is always desirable in itself and never pursued for the sake of something else. He called this ultimate end, *happiness*:

> Now happiness more than anything else is looked upon as some such thing, for we choose it always for its own sake and never for that of something else. Honour, pleasure, reason and every virtue we choose, indeed, for themselves, but we choose them also for the sake of happiness, supposing that by their means we shall be happy. No one, on the other hand, chooses happiness for the sake of these. (Aristotle, 1963, p. 12)

Aristotle further clarified this goal of virtue, called happiness, as self-sufficient, which he defined as that "which all on its own makes life desirable and lacking in nothing" (p. 12) and in the same context highlighted the element of "activity" in his definition: "Happiness then is something final and self-sufficient, and is the goal of activity" (p. 12).

A third qualifier Aristotle identified was related to the unique function of humans as compared to all forms of life, which he identified as an "active life of the rational element" (p. 13). It was his purpose in this context to separate human function from other forms of life, such as that of growth and reproduction, by the element of rational capability; and from the passive aspect which humans and subhumans are capable of by including the element of activity:

> There remains then an active life of the rational element. But since 'life of the rational element' also has a twofold meaning, we must state that we are referring to life in the sense of activity . . . (p. 13). For it is possible for the state of mind to exist and yet produce no good result; not so with the activity, because one who has it will necessarily be acting and acting well" (p. 15).

The connection between virtue and happiness was made very clear by Aristotle wherein he stated, "Our definition harmonizes with the view of those who maintain that happiness is virtue, or some particular virtue; for virtuous activity is part of virtue" (p. 15).

Not only did Aristotle specify the active aspect of virtue, but he also specified that it is expressed in the patterns of behavior over time rather than in any single or isolated act: "For one swallow does not make a summer, nor does a single day; and likewise one day or a brief period does not make man blessed and happy" (Aristotle, 1963, p. 13).

In addressing the question of where happiness comes from or how it is acquired, Aristotle skirts the question of a divine source, though seems to acknowledge such a possibility while emphasizing that happiness results from virtue by way of learning and training and requires study and care:

> Yet happiness, even if it is not heaven-sent but arises from virtue via some form of learning or training, seems to be among the most godlike things; for that which is the prize and end of virtue is obviously the best thing-something godlike and blessed. Nevertheless, it must be widely shared; for it is accessible, through a certain kind of study and care, to all whose capacity for virtue has not been maimed. (Aristotle, 1963, p. 16)

Aristotle understood moral virtue to be acquired by the repetition of virtuous acts, "Virtue being of two kinds, intellectual and moral, intellectual derives its origin and its growth mainly from teaching (wherefore it requires experience and time), while moral virtue is the fruit of habit" (Aristotle, 1963, p. 28). By habit, Aristotle is referring to repeatedly acting in a similar pattern and in a similar direction to the extent that one becomes disposed or inclined to act in that manner more consistently over time. Not only is this a mark of the virtuous person as such but also a mark of the mature person because of the repeated experiences of acting toward the good. Aristotle also recognized, however, that repetition alone, habituation alone, or even disposition alone was not enough. It had to be aimed toward the good. Inasmuch as "dispositions arise from like activities" (Aristotle, 1963, p. 29), the direction of choice toward virtue or vice is critical:

> . . . by doing the acts that we do in our dealings with other men we become just or unjust, and by doing the acts that we do in face of peril, and being habituated to feel confidence or fear, we become brave or cowardly. So also with appetites and feelings of anger: some men become temperate and good-tempered, others self-indulgent and bad-tempered, according as they behave in one way or another in given circumstances. (Aristotle, 1963, p. 29)

Aristotle was so clear about this distinction of the direction of action that he exclaimed, "It makes no small difference, then, whether we are habituated in one way or in another from youth upwards; indeed it makes a very great difference, nay *all* the difference" (Aristotle, 1963, p. 29).

Finally, with respect of the impact of habituation and disposition, Aristotle places significance on the idea that success breeds success in that the desired action must be acted on and the more it is acted on the stronger it becomes:

> ". . . by eschewing (virtuous) pleasures we become temperate, and it is when we have become so that we can best eschew them. And similarly as regards courage; by being habituated to despise and withstand objects of dread we become courageous, and

> when we have become so we shall best be able to stand firm in face of them. (Aristotle, 1963, p. 29)

Aristotle acknowledged that virtuous people are not in the majority for, "Most people, however, do not perform such acts" (Aristotle, 1963, p. 32).

Aristotle also sees moral virtues in relation to pleasure and pain: "Moral virtue then is concerned with pleasures and pains; it is because of the pleasure involved that we perform bad actions, and because of the pain involved that we abstain from noble actions" (Aristotle, 1963, p. 30). It is in this context that Aristotle includes the role of emotions or feelings in virtues in that "virtues are concerned with actions and feelings, and every feeling and every action is accompanied by pleasure or pain" (Aristotle, 1963, p. 30). Here he raises the concept of "oughtness" with respect to virtues where he stated, "moral virtue tends to do what is best with regard to pleasures and pains, whereas vice does the opposite" (Aristotle, 1963, p. 30).

Aristotle differentiates feelings from dispositions with respect to virtue and vice on the basis of intention:

> By 'dispositions' I mean those things by virtue of which we stand well or badly with reference to feelings; thus we stand badly with reference to anger if we experience it violently or too weakly, and well if we experience it moderately; and similarly as regards other feelings.
>
> Now neither the virtues nor the vices are *feelings*, (1) because we are called good or bad not on the basis of our feelings, but on that of our

> virtues and our vices . . . . Again (2), we feel anger and fear without set purpose, unintentionally, whereas the virtues are modes of intention or involve intention. Further (3), with respect to the feelings we are said to be *moved*, but with respect to the virtues and vices we are not said to be moved but to be *disposed* in such-and-such a way. (Aristotle, 1963, p. 33)

One final clarification of feelings and actions in virtues is highlighted by Aristotle in the context of acting in the mean rather than the extreme, "neither too much nor too little" (Aristotle, 1963, p.34):

> Now virtue is a mean between two vices, one arising from excess and the other from defect; and furthermore it is a mean because the vices fall short of or exceed what is right both in feelings and in actions, while virtue both finds and chooses the intermediate. (Aristotle, 1963, p. 35)

Thus, Aristotle's concept of moral virtue reflects patterns of action that are acquired, that are dispositions (states of character) as a result of habitation, that are strengthened by repetition, that are voluntarily chosen from alternatives within our own power, that involve rational and emotional elements, that are directed towards means rather than extremes, and are designed to yield happiness (Aristotle, 1963). Finally, Aristotle's virtues were not regarded as all equal, but were described as a hierarchy in that some were more important than others.

Aristotle's list of moral virtues included: 1) Courage, 2) Temperance, 3) virtues concerned with Wealth, (liberality and munificence), 4) virtues concerned with

Honour (pride and ambition), 5) Good Temper, 6) virtues of Social Intercourse (amiability, truthfulness, ready wit and tact, 7) Shame, a quasi virtue, and 8) Justice. Aristotle differentiated these from the intellectual virtues by which truth is found which included the Major Intellectual Virtues of 1) Scientific knowledge, 2) Art, 3) Practical wisdom, 4) Intuitive reason, and 5) Theoretical wisdom; and the Minor Intellectual Virtues of 1) Sound deliberation, 2) Understanding, and 3) Judgement (Aristotle, 1963).

St. Thomas Aquinas' Philosophy

Aristotle's list of virtues remained the norm for centuries. With the fall of Rome in the 5th Century, the works of the Greek philosophers were lost until rediscovered by Arab scholars and made available to the west in the 13th century. Thomas Aquinas is credited as the scholar who integrated Aristotle into western thought (Hall, in press). He adapted Aristotle's list of moral virtues into his own list of twenty virtues, which hinged on four main moral virtues of prudence, justice, courage, and temperance (Aquinas, p. 300).

In tracing the historical development of virtues, Brian Hall noted that "like the Greeks, every culture and every religion has its own unique ethical list of those human attributes which make up the virtuous person" (p. 6, in press) and "the more organized of these cultures will have these ethical lists written down" (p. 7). Hall also pointed out that other christian writers added the virtues of faith, hope and charity to St. Thomas' list, which were felt to be more important than the original four, and charity was described to be the greatest of all. Hall (in press) also suggested that the Apostle Paul's list in his letter to Galatians known as the 'works of the flesh' are vices and the 'fruit of the Spirit' are virtues.

While St. Thomas was heavily influenced by Aristotle, there were significant differences in their perspectives. Thomas Gilby, who edited and translated St. Thomas' work cited here, highlighted one of those differences in his description of St. Thomas: "There are two wisdoms, he held, natural and supernatural; the acquired knowledge of things in their highest rational causes, and the infused knowledge of things in the revelation of the divine mysteries" (Aquinas, 1960, p. xix).

St. Thomas held strongly to the role of rational thought, but also seemed to express a balanced awareness of the emotional influence, which seemed to include a spiritual dimension as implied, for example, in his concept of love. Gilby described it, ". . . with knowledge the object is taken into the knower, while with love the lover goes out to the object" (Aquinas, p. 252).

In his *Disputations, de Caritate*, 3, St. Thomas states, "Love is the form, mover, and root of the virtues" (Aquinas, 1960, p. 300). Furthermore, he stated in *Summa Theologica*, 2a-2ae.cxxv. 2, "All fear springs from love. Ordered love is included in every virtue, disordered love in every vice" (Aquinas, 1960, p. 703).

In his *Disputations*, XXII *de Veritate*, 7, Aquinas stated that "Man has a natural urge towards complete goodness" (Aquinas, 1960, p. 280), which Gilby explained reflects St. Thomas' Moral Theory in the sense that "The moral imperative is not categoric, but condition; act well if you would reach happiness" (Aquinas, 1960, p. 280). It follows, in St. Thomas' view, that evil cannot exist in and of itself but as he put it in III *Contra Gentes*, 7, "Evil is a deprivation of good, and a privation is not a nature or real essence, it is a negation in a subject" (Aquinas, 1960, p. 168).

Like Aristotle, Aquinas referred to happiness, in his *Commentary, I Ethics, lect*. 14, as "the greatest human good, the end to which all others are subordinate" (Aquinas, 1960, p. 264). Furthermore he described this ultimate good in two senses, one in the abstract which expresses the concept of finality of which all agree, and the other more concretely with respect to where this can be found and for which there is little agreement. He illustrated his point in *Summa Theologica*, Ia-2ae. i.7

where he stated, "Deliciousness is delightful to every taste, but some find it best in wine, others in candy, and so forth" (Aquinas, 1960, p. 265).

Aquinas is clear to point out that moral activity itself is not the final happiness because moral activity is aimed at something above itself. In his Opusc. XIII, *compendium Theologiae*, 104, he refers to two kinds of potentiality:

> . . .the first is natural, and relates to a thing's actualization by a natural force, the second relates to a further actualization requiring a higher active principle. . . . Our last end can be achieved only if the natural desire of the mind to know is actualized and stilled by an active principle nobler than anything that is part of us or of our sort of world. This desire is such that, when an effect is perceived, we crave to know its cause. . . .
>
> Our natural desire, therefore, will not be quieted until we know the first cause, not from reflections, but by its very essence. The first cause is God. Therefore the ultimate end of rational creatures is the vision of the essence of God. (Aquinas, 1960, pp. 274-275)

Not only does St. Thomas view the ultimate end of humans to be found in God, but he also implies in Disputations, XI *de Veritate*, I, that the ultimate beginnings of these moral virtues have their source with God by virtue of their potentiality in our created beings. In responding to the extreme positions of the source being entirely innate or entirely implanted, Aquinas argued:

> . . . virtuous habits pre-exist, not as achieved qualities of character, but as instinctive propensities. These are the beginnings of virtue, brought afterwards to completion by appropriate

> activities. It is the same with the acquisition of knowledge: the early conceptions of the mind are like seeds before they are cultivated. They are known directly in the light of the active intellect through meanings abstracted from sense-objects, whether they be simple concepts, such as being, unity, and so forth, or whether they be judgements, such as first principles - knowledge is planted in these seeds of meaning. When it is raised from the knowledge of these general truths to the actual knowledge of particular truths (formerly known potentially and as it were in general) then the mind is said to acquire scientific knowledge. (Aquinas, 1960, p. 378)

This last conception, not only implies that St. Thomas sees God as the beginning and the ultimate end of human endeavor, but this whole principle of potentialities sounds strikingly similar to Brian Hall's concept of inner images that are mediated and energized into our outer reality via values (Hall, 1986) and even Carl Jung's whole concept of the collective unconscious (Jung, 1963).

In reviewing some of the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas on virtues, it is apparent that he was heavily influenced by Aristotle and for the most part, his position seems more similar than different. Perhaps, he even expressed some of those similarities more articulately than Aristotle, particularly his discussions of the role of virtuous habits in the sense of their strength. For example, he described habit in *Summa Theologica* as a "quality" and as a "settled disposition" (Aquinas, 1960, p. 297) and clarified that, "A habit is not a disposition of the object towards the power, but of the power towards the object" (p. 298). He further described virtue as a "habit ensuring good performance" (p. 302) in two manners: first by providing the ability or "aptness" and second by assuring the power for the "right use", . . . "thus justice makes the will prompt to deal fairly, and also sees to it that this intention is carried through into execution" (p. 302).

Virtues and Values

Having explored the historical roots of the virtues and previously discussed a variety of definitions of values, it seems appropriate to now address the question of their similarities and differences.

The similarities in definitions of virtues and values are inescapably present. Both place an emphasis on behavior or activity that is freely chosen toward a desirable end. Both place significance on the involvement of cognitive and affective elements, and both highlight the pattern of activity rather than any one single event as evidence of the presence of a given virtue or value. Finally, both include the concept of a hierarchy upon which precedence of action is dependent.

What then are the differences? For the most part, the differences are more subtle. In the first instance, with the emphasis of virtues on being a divine right for the aristocracy, implied they were an elite group. Bishops and Kings led people to believe that they just naturally inherited them at birth (Hall, in press), as if virtues were not intended to be universal, whereas values are seen to be something all people have, though some people's values are different from others. Secondly, virtues seem to have a narrower field of application and are limited to those pursuits that are particularly lofty, and even religious, whereas values are more numerous, and apply to a broader range of activities. Thirdly, virtues carry a connotation of strength and persistence that is not so apparent in the values literature. Finally, the term virtue has a long history and tradition whereas the term value is relatively new as it applies to the pursuit of human excellence.

Virtues or Values

In the context of this study, the term virtue probably is the more accurate term in the sense of its lofty pursuits, its historical religious tradition and its emphasis on the Divine power as its source. However, the term virtue also carries linguistic connotations that are not held in high esteem in our culture today. For example, the dictionary meaning of the term virtue includes the terms "chastity" and "purity" (Avis, Drysdale, Gregg & Scargill, 1973) which are not particularly popular or desired traits in today's society. Similarly, the word "prudence" is commonly confused with the word "prude", which is a negative term in our culture. Some people struggle with the word "righteous", though it is a lofty and accurate word, because it conjures up meanings of "self-righteous" for them and detracts from its original intent. It is for these same kind of reasons that the ancient and accurate word "virtue" carries negative connotations with it that many people in today's culture do not identify with and even shun. Most people do not consider themselves to be "virtuous" persons but they do identify with having certain "values" that are important to them. The term "value" seems to be more widely accepted in our society and therefore is the term applied to the content scales of this Christian Lifestyle Inventory.

This chapter on the review of the literature has four major sections. Thus far, relevant value theories, and the similarities and differences between virtues and values have been covered. These preceding sections have led up to this next section which provides a detailed exegetical analysis of Scripture, yielding the definitions of the nine christian values as they are used in this study.

Definitions of Christian Values

> But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. Galatians 5: 22,23 (NIV)

> Remain in me, and I will remain in you. No branch can bear fruit by itself; it must remain in the

> vine. Neither can you bear fruit unless you remain in me. John 15: 4 (NIV)

> The entire law is summed up in a single command: "Love your neighbor as yourself". Galatians 5: 14 (NIV)

The term "love" in the scriptures has different meanings depending on the context and on the specific original greek term used. The greek term "Eros" is used to refer to erotic love in a romantic and sexual context. The greek term "Storge" is used to refer to family love in the context of kinship. The term "Philio" is used to refer to friendship love or brotherly love in the context of friends. The term 'Agape" is used in the context of the Scriptures quoted above and is the kind of love referred to in the Fruit of the Spirit of God. It is an all encompassing love that is to permeate all of the other kinds of love and as such represents an overarching quality that is intended to be present in all relationships (Dyer, 1984; Lewis, 1960).

The original greek term for the word "Fruit" in the text under consideration is singular indicating that these nine evidences of the Spirit, or as considered in this project, christian values, are intended to go together in a collective whole, though each one carries its own distinctive characteristic (Dyer, 1984). Stamm (1953) interpreted this singular status to mean that each of the specific elements was simply love in another form. Buttrick (1962) agreed and stated that, "Love is the crown of every virtue: patience, gentleness, self-control, fidelity, kindness are all expressions of love itself; and thus love is the first fruit of the Holy Spirit" (p. 174). Similarly, Cole (1974) described "agape" as being central to all nine evidences of the Fruit of the Spirit, to be seen as embracing all the rest. Maloney (1986) agreed with the idea that love was the overarching quality of all of the virtues and consequently eliminated it as a specific subscale in his Life Style Inventory. While this overarching aspect of love is an important factor to acknowledge, it is included as a specific subscale in the Christian Lifestyle Inventory for reasons to be discussed later in this paper.

As a final general consideration, the issue of source of these christian values is addressed. Brian Hall (1986) referred to values as the mediators between one's inner reality of images and the sensory reality of one's external everyday world. The reality of these inner images was addressed by Carl Jung in the opening lines of *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* where he wrote, "My life is a story of the self-realization of the unconscious. Everything in the unconscious seeks outward manifestation, and the personality too desires to evolve out of its unconscious conditions and to experience itself as a whole" (1963, p. 3). Jung elaborated on his concept of the unconscious where he wrote:

> The rationally explicable unconscious, which consists of material that has been made unconscious artificially, as it were, is only a top layer, and that underneath is an absolute unconscious which has nothing to do with our personal experience. This absolute unconscious would then be a psychic activity which goes on independently of the conscious mind and is not dependent even on the upper layers of the unconscious, untouched - and perhaps untouchable - by personal experience. It would be a kind of supra-individual psychic activity, a *collective unconscious*, as I have called it, as distinct from a superficial relative, or personal unconscious. (Hall, 1986, p. 36)

If we are wanting to identify a place where these first seeds of christian values germinate, it may be appropriate to locate them in the heart of this deeper level of the unconscious described so aptly by Jung.

Love

Analysis

"Agape" love is not an ordinary human capacity, but rather it finds its origin in God:

> Dear friends, let us love one another, for love comes from God. Everyone who loves has been born of God and knows God. Whoever does not love does not know God, because God is love. This is how God

> showed his love among us: He sent his one and only Son into the world that we might live through him. This is love: not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son as an atoning sacrifice for our sins. Dear friends, since God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. No one has ever seen God; but if we love each other, God lives in us and his love is made complete in us. (I John 4:7-12 NIV)
>
> God is love. Whoever lives in love lives in God, and God in him. (I John 4:16b NIV)
>
> We love because he first loved us. (I John 4:19 NIV)

Perhaps the most fundamental characteristic of the kind of "love" referred to in the greek word Agape is in its inner reality and outer manifestation. Cranfield (1950), in referring to Romans 5:5 suggests that this love is actually the Divine love poured into us and overflowing into the lives of others, as an extension of God's love for us. He further suggests that this christian love is an "imitation" of the Divine love referring to several scriptural passages (I John 4:11, Romans 12:1, 15:7, Matthew 5:43, Luke 6:35, John 13:34, 15:12, Ephesians 4:32-5:2, 5:25). Buttrick (1962) described this love in the context of God's relationship to people and their response in terms of (a) Divine love manifested to humans, "God showed his love to us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8); (b) humans answering love for God, and (c) humans love for others. He emphasized that . . . "the motive to love one another arises from gratitude for divine grace rather than fear of judgement" (p. 173).

John Dyer (1984) referred to the relationship between God's love for us, and our love for others as "God's love flowing into us and out to others". Scott Peck (1985) referred to Jesus' words in Matthew 22:37-39, "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: Love your neighbor as yourself" (p. 83). He interpreted Jesus linking of the two to mean that . . . "they are equivalents in different languages. If we are loving our neighbor as ourself, we are also loving God. And if we truly love God, we will truly love our neighbor" (p. 83). Buttrick (1962) similarly states that the "Love of God may be virtually equated with love for the neighbor" (p. 170) as implied in Hebrews 6:10, I Peter 2:17, and I John 4:7-12, 19.

Buttrick (1962) further clarifies the nature of this "agape" love in his disagreement with Nygren who had stated that, "Through the invasion of the Holy Spirit, God's free, dynamic love flows from the believer toward the neighbor. It is not really the believer's at all" (p. 173). Buttrick rejects the concept on the same basis as the notion that faith is a moment of passivity! Rather, he says, "Surely, it is the Christian who is to love, not God in the believer!" (p. 173).

Stamm (1953) further clarified the intent of the term neighbor in the directive of Galatians 5:14 by referring to Galatians 6:2 wherein neighbor refers to "the one who is near" (p. 565) and then in ever increasing concentric circles to embrace all people (Galatians 6:10, I Thessalonians 5:15, I Corinthians 9:22). Buttrick (1962) highlighted this love that gives, expecting no return (Luke 6:35) in reference to all people. He refers to it as an "active benevolence . . . that ignores conventions of race, sex and culture" (p. 170). It is not prejudice!

Stamm (1953) identified three elements in the "agape" love described by Paul: (a) esteem, (b) devotion, and (c) mutuality. To esteem one's neighbor is to view one's neighbor with high regard, as one who is loved by God, to wish and hope well-being for one's neighbor. To be devoted to one's neighbor means to do good for that person, to be affectionate toward them. Mutuality suggests desiring a return in love from one's neighbor, but not as a condition of giving love; but rather, for the purpose of being in relationship. He further suggests that mutuality refers to loving one's neighbor to the same degree as oneself. "To love your neighbor less than yourself was to treat him as a means to your ends, and to love him more would have made him use you as a means to his ends" (p. 559). It requires that a person values oneself correctly, neither in pride nor in false humility, but with a balanced self-love.

Vine (1952) described the use of the "agape" term in the New Testament to refer to (a) the attitude of God toward his Son, Jesus (John 17:26), (b) the attitude of God toward the human race generally (John 3:16, Romans 5:8), and (c) the attitude of God toward those that believe (John 14;21), and to convey his will to his people concerning their attitude (d) to love one another (John 13:34), (e) to all people (I Thessalonians 3:12, I Corinthians 16:14, II Peter 1:7), and (f) to express the essential nature of God (I John 4:8).

Vine describes this unconditional love this way: "Christian love . . . is not an impulse from the feelings, it does not always run with the natural inclinations, nor does it spend itself only upon those for whom some affinity is discovered" (1952, p. 21). Love seeks the welfare of all (Romans 15:2), and works no ill to any (Romans 13:8-10), and love seeks opportunity to do good to all people (Galatians 6:10).

Perhaps the most vivid description of what this "agape" love is and is not, is found in the poem written by the Apostle Paul:

> Love is patient,
>   love is kind.
> It does not envy,
>   it does not boast,
>   it is not proud.
> It is not rude,

> it is not self-seeking,
> it is not easily angered,
> it keeps no record of wrongs.
> Love does not delight in evil
> but rejoices with the truth.
> It always protects,
> always trusts,
> always hopes,
> always perseveres.
> Love never fails. (I Corinthians 13:4-8 NIV)

The inner reality associated with "agape" love seems to be an awareness of God's love and forgiveness that translates into an outer reality of active concern for the well-being of all people.

On the basis of the above discourse, the following formal definition of "agape" love is tendered:

Definition

Love: Proceeds from the Spirit of God dwelling within, and one's personal experiencing of God's love. It is a response of the heart to the love of God, issuing in love of the same kind toward others. An attitude of willing, unconditional acceptance of others. A concern for the well-being of all others, regardless of who they are or what they do. A willingness to share another's joy and suffer another's pain. Agape love does not discriminate between people. It appreciates, values and esteems all persons.

In the preceding discussion, it was clearly acknowledged that love is an overarching value, involved in all of the other eight christian values under consideration in this study. The decision to maintain its separate identity in the scale is based on three factors: First, it is identified as a separate category in the original scriptural text; secondly, it will allow for a specific subscale that will measure the *unconditional* aspect of love and *equal acceptance* of all people. This option seems particularly important since the prevalence of prejudice has been found to be an issue in several studies of christian populations (Rokeach, 1970; Batson & Ventis, 1982; Spilka, Hood & Gorsuch, 1985). Finally, it seems more appropriate to allow the results of factor analysis to determine the relatedness of the subscales in this experimental inventory than to arbitrarily eliminate it solely on the basis of a preliminary rationale.

Joy

Analysis

The greek word "chara" as used in this text translates: "gladness, "delight", and most commonly "joy". It is similar to the verb "chairo" which translates: "to rejoice" (Vine, 1952). John Dyer (1984) noted the similarity of "joy" to the greek word for "grace", which is "charis". They come from the same root. This grace is a gift from God in the form of Divine favor (Acts 14:26) (Buttrick, 1962). Here, the stress is on its "freeness and universality, its spontaneous character" (Vine, 1952, p. 170). It is a gift of mercy and forgiveness offered unconditionally to which the recipient responds with a feeling of gratitude, a sense of thankfulness, leading to expressions of thanksgiving, praise, and joyfulness (Vine, 1952). Joy is associated with life, a verve for living, life to the full (I Thessalonians 3:8-9, John 10:10). Experiences of sorrow increase the capacity for joy (John 16:20, Romans 5:3-4, II Corinthians 7:4, 8:2, Hebrews 10:34, James 1:2). Buttrick (1962) noted that the Old Testament "joy" refers to celebrations and other expressions of joy, whereas the New Testament adds the concept of joy in suffering and weakness seen in terms of the power of God (Matthew 5:12, II Corinthians 12:9). Other sources of "joy" include faith (Romans 15:13, Philippians 1:25), hope (Romans 5:2, 12:12), and the joy of others (Romans 12:15). In both the Old and New Testaments, God is the ground and object of the Christian's joy (Palms 35:9, 43:4, Isaiah 61:10, Luke 1:47, Romans 5:11, Philippians 3:1, 4:4 (Vine, 1952).

Stamm (1953) highlighted the contagious communication of joy and the capacity to rejoice amid the worst circumstances, noting examples of the Apostle Paul (II Corinthians 1:11, Philippians 4:11). He described this "joy" as a deep "all pervasive character" rather than a "pious wish", an "inward satisfaction" expressing itself in an "outward benediction" (p. 567).

One of the elements of this "joy", which seems to arise from the Hebrew influence, was that of community. It related to the whole life of Israel or the church (Smith, 1950), and was part of the praise and thanksgiving in public worship (Buttrick, 1962), and occurred in the context of the body of Christians (Stamm, 1953). The range of expression seems to be one of exuberant joy and thanksgiving, as in public worship, to that of quiet contentment and confidence (Buttrick, 1962).

Based on the above considerations, it seems that the inner reality or source of christian "joy" is anchored in a deep sense of benefaction of God's mercy and forgiveness, inseparable from God's love, grounded in faith and hope, encouraged within a fellowship of Christians and deepened through perseverance in suffering and sorrow. The outer reality or expression of this "joy" is seen in graciousness, thankfulness, and a verve for living. It is an expression of being "glad to be alive" and a celebration of life with those around them.

It is in this context that the following definition of "Joy" is offered:

Definition

> Joy: Proceeds from the Spirit of God dwelling within, and one's personal experiencing of God's love and forgiveness. It has its base in confidence,

hope and knowledge that God is sovereign in all things and ever present. It is an attitude characterized by a deep conviction of well-being and continual rejoicing regardless of one's circumstance. It reflects gratitude, thankfulness and praise to God and may be expressed in many ways from quiet contentment to exuberant excitement. It is not stifled, but deepened by experiences of sorrow and suffering. It is fully appreciating God, oneself and others.

Peace

Analysis

The greek word for "peace" used in this text is "eirene" which translates; "harmony", "wholeness", "unity" and "peace". The term is used in a variety of contexts in the New Testament: (a) harmonious relationships between people (Matthew 10:34, Romans 14:19), (b) between nations (Luke 14:32, Acts 12:20, Revelations 6:4), (c) friendliness (Acts 15:33, I Corinthians 16:11, Hebrews 11:31), (d) freedom from molestation (Luke 11:21, 19:42, Acts 9:31, 16:36), (e) order (Acts 24:2, I Corinthians 14:33), (f) harmonized relationships between God and people (Acts 10:36, Ephesians 2:17), and (g) rest and contentment (Matthew 10:13, Mark 5:34, Luke 1:79, 2:29, John 14:27, Romans 1:7, 3:17, 8:6). The corresponding greek verb, "eireneuo" translates: "to bring peace", "to reconcile", "to keep peace or to be at peace" (Vine, 1952, p. 170).

C. F. Evans (1950) referred to the word "shalom" as the Hebrew counterpart of the greek word "eirene" which means "totality", "well-being", or "harmony" with an emphasis on prosperity untouched by violence or misfortune. He suggested that the kernel of its meaning was "community with others" as in "unity" (p. 165). He also clarified that the New Testament emphasis is on "harmony" and "reconciliation". Buttrick (1962) provided a similar description and added a reference to "proper orderliness" as contrasted with "confusion" (I Corinthians 14:33) (p. 706). A further New Testament emphasis of "peace" is in reference to "peace of mind" and "serenity" (Romans 8:6, 15:13, 14:17, Galatians 5:22, Philippians 4:7, Colossians 3:5, John 14:27) (p. 706).

Perhaps Dyer (1984) gave the more practical and clear conception of "eirene" by putting it in the context of "a sense of order, even in the midst of difficulties". He included obedience to God's order, living by God's principles, as the way of order and direction in peoples lives. He further identified three kinds of order: (a) spiritual order in the form of peace with God (Romans 5), (b) psychological order as in serenity through the peace of God (Philippians 4), and (c) relational order in the form of peace on earth (Ephesians 2). Stamm (1953) tied this "peace" to a sense of hope and also God's love (Romans 8:38-39).

The inner reality of this "peace" arises from an awareness that purpose and peace are related, desirable and possible, strengthened by the hope that comes from knowing that nothing can separate one from the love of God. The outer reality is seen in a sense of purpose and quiet confidence, in spite of difficult times, and a desire to be reconciled to others by genuine efforts to resolve conflicts, within and without, rather than deny or avoid issues.

Based on the above discourse, the following definition of "Peace" is offered:

Definition

> Peace: Proceeds from the Spirit of God dwelling within, and one's personal experiencing of God's love and forgiveness. A sense of restored wholeness in relationship to God, self and others. An integrated person who is transparently congruent, with nothing to hide. One whose peaceableness is committed to resolving conflict both within and without. A sense of purpose, orderliness, direction and clearness of priorities in dealing with circumstances and people that is consistent with God's love and forgiveness. It is strengthened by a practised obedience of God's principles that yields

a oneness - a harmony with God, self and others. A residing sense of well-being, calmness and assurance that God is involved and in ultimate control, even when the harmony of events cannot be seen or imagined.

Patience

Analysis

The greek word "makrothumia" is used here and translates: "patience", "longsuffering", or "forbearance". The corresponding verb, "makrothumeo" translates: "to be long tempered", or "patiently endured" (Vine, 1952). Buttrick (1962) highlighted the notion that the Galatians 5:22 reference is given in the context of relationship with others rather than circumstances and refers to God's attitude toward wrongdoers, not condoning evil but hoping that "patience" will lead the wrongdoer to repentance. It is an active choice to delay inflicting deserved punishment of sin, in hope that repentance may take place (Romans 2:4, II Peter 3:9). He emphasized that "patience" is designed to preserve unity in the fellowship (Ephesians 4:2). Vine (1952) described "patience" as a quality of "self-restraint in the face of provocation . . . associated with mercy" (p. 12), even as God is merciful (Exodus 34:2, Romans 2:4, I Peter 3:20). He further describes "patience" as an active quality that does not surrender to circumstances nor succumb under trial. It is not despondency but is associated with hope (I Thessalonians 1:3). Smith (1950) depicted its active ingredient as more than endurance, " . . . it is a lively outgoing power of faith, an active energy rather than a passive resignation" (p. 165), that is inseparable from hope and faith in God. The purpose of "patience" is "for the sake of mercy" (p. 130), and therefore forgiveness is central to "patience". Smith states, it "involves readiness to forgive, and unwillingness to insist upon personal rights to the detriment of another" (p. 85). It seems that the issue at hand is a matter of delaying angry reactions and forgiving those that offend in order to prevent escalating conflict in favor of reconciliation. The active choice in the matter seems to stem from the ability to put the welfare of another, even an enemy, before one's own welfare. It is a courageous active "turning of one's cheek" for the sake of the other. Dyer (1984) emphasized the issue of managing ones anger, not ignoring one's own anger, for the sake of the other.

Patience seems to be related to reconciled relationships in the context of peace, harmony and unity. It is an active quality that shows itself in an outer reality of enduring hardship and wrongdoing for the purpose of being merciful. A willingness to be more concerned about the welfare of others than oneself. A disciplined active honest management of one's own anger.

In consideration of the forgoing information, the following definition of "patience" is proposed:

Definition

Patience: Proceeds from the Spirit of God dwelling within, and one's personal experiencing of God's love, forgiveness and endurance. It expresses itself in active restraint and tolerance in the face of opposition, provocation or even oppression. Does not act hastily in anger or retaliation. Refrains from escalating conflict in relationships, in the hope that the other will change his/her ways. Longsuffering, tender, forebearing, and slow to anger in relationships.

Kindness

Analysis

The greek term "chrestotes" used in this text translates: "good", "gracious", "kind" and "goodness of heart". The corresponding verb, "chrestos" also includes the translated term "easy". The Authorized Version of the Bible uses the term "gentleness", which emphasizes the qualities of humility and meekness. According to Vine (1952), the term "chrestotes", refers to goodness in action, expressing itself in deeds of gentleness. In contrast with deeds of righteous indignation (Romans

11:22). Vine interprets this term to mean actions carried out with grace, tenderness, and compassion. He refers to Lightfoot who expresses it as a kindly disposition to others (II Corinthians 6:6, Ephesians 2:7, Colossians 3:12, Titus 3:4).

There seems to be some confusion between the use of this term for "kindness" and the greek term "agathosune" used for "goodness". Maloney (1986) chose to combine the two into one subscale in his Life Style Inventory because of a lack of clear differentiation. However, Vine (1952), referring to Trench who followed the arguments of Jerome suggested that 'chrestotes" is the kindlier aspect of "goodness", whereas "agathosune" is the sterner qualities by which doing good to others is not necessarily by gentle means only, referring to Christ with the penitent woman in Luke 7:37-50 in contrast with Christ cleansing the temple in Matthew 21:12-13, and with the pharisees in Matthew 23:13-29.

The inner reality of "kindness" seems to reflect an awareness of the gift of God's love and forgiveness and a gracious, thankful response in humility and meekness. The outer reality is an outflowing of God's love in the form of choosing to do kind things for others because of a concern for their well-being.

In consideration of the above factors, the following definition of "kindness" is suggested:

Definition

Kindness: Proceeds from the Spirit of God dwelling within, and one's personal experiencing of God's love directed toward others. It is benevolent doing good to others in the absence of expecting gain or return. It implies a sensitive, considerate, compassionate attitude in action toward all people. A ready willingness to render a service to benefit someone else. It implies a recognition of one's position in the world as no better or no worse than another - equally loved by God. (Kindness, as defined here, is directed at specific persons rather than at groups of people or society at large.)

Goodness

Analysis

The greek word, "agathosune" used in this text translates: "goodness" signifying a "moral quality", "to be and to do good" (Romans 15:14, Ephesians 5:9, II Thessalonians 1:2) (Vine, 1952, p. 165). As previously mentioned, Vine refers to Trench who distinguishes "agathosune" as a more stern quality than "chrestotes". He also refers to Lightfoot who distinguishes "chrestotes" as a "kindly disposition toward others" and "agathosune" as a "kindly activity on their behalf" (p. 165). Stamm (1953) also described the Apostle Paul's use of this term in a general sense of goodness:

> The Christian was not only to be good, but good for something: to let his light shine, to be worthy of his call and his calling, to teach men the knowledge of God, and to bring the ideals of the Spirit into fruition in everyday life. (p. 568)

Buttrick (1962) referred to the Old Testament meaning of "goodness" to mean God's grace and care for the humble-minded and the poor, to seek Him and to seek good, to hate evil and to love good (Amos 5:6, 14-15). He understood this text to be synonymous with seeking justice, correcting oppression, defending the fatherless, and pleading for the widow (Isaiah 1:12-17). E. C. Blackman (1950) noted the similarity of the greek verb "agathos" with the Hebrew word "tob" which is often used in reference to aesthetic and moral judgements. He noted that it is often used synonymously with "right" as a more ethical term (Deuteronomy 6:18, 12:28, Joshua 9:25, I Samuel 12:23). Blackman contrasted this Old Testament concept of "goodness" with the New Testament addition that it is unattainable apart from God (Matthew 5:16, Romans 8:4, 28; 12:2, Ephesians 2:10). Blackman confined the use of this term to the context of a standard by which the "goodness" of an act is judged.

The inner reality of "goodness" seems to reflect a sense of fairness, justice, and a responsibility to have a good effect in society. The outer reality seems to be one of action toward that overall good of society.

In response to the above considerations, the following definition is proposed:

Definition

Goodness: Proceeds from the Holiness of the Spirit of God dwelling within, and one's personal experiencing of God's love and forgiveness from which virtue overflows. A spiritual quality, a moral ideal to be and to do what is right and honourable and to oppose what is evil and unjust. It may include a sterner quality by which doing what is right is not necessarily by gentle means only. It implies fairness, integrity, and justice. It serves to enhance communities and makes this world a better place to live. (Goodness, as defined here, is generally directed to benefit groups of people, communities, or society at large with the exception where acts of justice and honesty may benefit individual persons.

Faithfulness

Analysis

The greek word "pistis" in this text translates: 'A firm persuasion", "conviction". It is always used in the New Testament in reference to faith in God or things spiritual (Vine, 1952, p. 71). The word is used in reference to trust (Romans 3:23, I corinthians 2:5, 15:14,17; II Corinthians 1:24, Galatians 3:23, Philippians 1:25, 2:17; I Thessalonians 3:2, II Thessalonians 1:3, 3:2; and in reference to trustworthiness (Matthew 23:23, Romans 3:3) (Vine, 1952). The main elements in the use of the term "faith", both in the greek noun "pistis", and its corresponding verb, "pisteuo" are (a) a firm conviction, producing a full acknowledgement of God's revelation (II Thessalonians 2:11-12), (b) a personal surrender to Him (John 1:12, and (c) a conduct inspired by such surrender (II Corinthians 5:7) (Vine, 1952).

Stamm (1953) links both "faith" in God and "faithfulness" to others as one and the same. The latter is not possible without the former. He ascribed the secret of Paul's faithfulness to his faith, "acting to present himself as a living sacrifice in rationale service to God" (p. 568). His faith made him trustworthy, truthful, sincere, and faithful to duty. "It steadied him in the storms of life" (p. 568). Buttrick (1962) explained faith primarily as "trust" rather than "belief". . . "a matter of personal relationship rather than knowledge" (p. 222). John Dyer (1984) emphasized obedience as an act of faith. He also highlighted that the Christian's faithfulness is based on the faithfulness of God. The Christian's confidence in God leads to faithfulness and trustworthiness to others. Cole (1974) equated this faithfulness with reliability on two planes: one in relationship with God and the other in relationship with people. Whitehouse (1950) essentially reiterated this same strong concept between a trust in God and a trustworthiness to others.

The inner reality of "faithfulness" seems to reflect a reliance, confidence in the dependability of God. The outer reality is seen as a trustworthy, dependable, and reliable relationship with others.

Given the foregoing, the following definition is rendered:

Definition

> Faithfulness: Proceeds from the Spirit of God dwelling within, and one's personal experiencing of God's love, forgiveness, and steadfastness. It is a confidence in and dependence on God as completely trustworthy and reliable. A constant and consistent unselfish quality in one's attitude and action toward others. Trustworthy, reliable and dependable.

Gentleness

Analysis

The greek term "prautes" as used in this text denotes "meekness". Its use in Scripture carries a meaning which has a deeper significance than in other greek writings. It refers to an ". . . inwrought grace of the soul. . . . It is that temper of spirit in which we accept His dealings with us as good, and therefore without disputing or resisting" (Vine, 1952, p. 55). It is closely linked with the word "humility" (Ephesians 4:2, Colossians 3:12). In the text of Galatians 5:23, it is also associated with "self-control". Vine notes that there is no English word that correctly translates this greek word. Meekness is suggested as a reflection of an inner attitude but the greek word does not connote weakness but rather it suggests a position of strength. The other authorized English word is "gentle", which implies outward action to others but it fails to reflect the inner attitude of meekness. The implication is that Christ was not "meek" because of weakness but rather because of confidence and strength . . . "because he had the infinite resources of God at his command" (Vine, 1952, p. 56). Stamm (1953) included the adjectives of modesty, gentleness, courtesy, lowliness and patience to meekness (Colossians 3:12) and compared it to the opposite of insolent, haughty, boastful, aggressive, and arrogant defiance. Buttrick (1962) and Richardson (1950) described meekness as the opposite of pride which relies on self. Buttrick described meekness as an attitude shown to others by one who is meek before God. He clarified the terms by indicating that meekness refers to an inner attitude and gentleness refers to dealing with others.

Stott (1978) in his analysis of the Sermon on the Mount from Matthew 5-7 noted that meekness was placed between those that mourn their sin and those that thirst after righteousness. Dr. Lloyd-Jones (1977) understood meekness simply as one expressing a true view of oneself, "The man who is truly meek is the one who is truly amazed that God and man can think of him as well as they do and treat him as well as they do" (p.69). John Dyer (1984) referred to Aristotle's conception of "prautes" as "middle of the road" which is the opposite of extreme, "not being swept to and fro but staying stable in the middle". He described it in terms of anger with rage on one extreme and indifference on the other with "prautes" in the middle. It seems to suggest a balance in which one recognizes one's position in the world as equal, one of the created, who is no better nor worse than another; one who is able to respond with consideration of the other rather than to overreact. To act rather than react from a position of being at home with oneself where one has no need to retaliate or control.

The inner reality of "gentleness" seems to be one of gratitude of God's gift of love and forgiveness which yields a sense of meekness in relationship to God. The outer reality seems to be a response of gentleness to others that is chosen from a position of being "comfortable", or "at hone" with oneself.

In consideration of the foregoing, the following definition is proposed:

Definition

Gentleness: Proceeds from the Spirit of God dwelling within and one's personal experiencing of God's love and forgiveness. A quality of strength, so confident of one's own self-worth and acceptance because of God's love and forgiveness that defensiveness and aggressiveness are unnecessary. Intimacy, transparency, vulnerability and a sensitive thoughtfulness are characteristic of relationships with others. Even as Christ was humble because he had the infinite resources of God at his command, gentleness is a benevolent friendliness, a sensitive gracious action toward others without concern for oneself.

Self-Control

Analysis

The greek term "enkrateia" used in this text translates: "strength". It occurs in Acts 24:25, Galatians 5:23, and II Peter 1:6 where it is rendered "temperance", though "self-control" is the preferred rendering because it has a broader meaning. In Acts 24:25 the word follows "righteousness", implying that this self-control represents a person's response in kind to God's righteousness. In II Peter 1:6 the word follows "knowledge", suggesting that what is learned requires putting it into practice (Vine, 1952).

Cole (1974) emphasized the use of strength or power directed self-ward. Stamm (1953) noted two kinds of self-control. One being self-control over self-indulgence in the areas of sexual immorality, idolatry and witchcraft, hatred, rage, jealousy, self-ambition, prejudice, drunkenness, etc. (I Corinthians 7:9, Galatians 5:19-21). The other, Stamm noted, was like the self-discipline of an athlete in training (I Corinthians 9:24-27). Stamm also emphasized that the Apostle Paul's self-control resulted from his spiritual experience rather than an exercise simply for the purpose of inducing self-discipline. It was motivated internally, by the Spirit of God. Similarly, Buttrick (1962) interpreted self-control as a matter of controlling the sources of human passionate energies such as anger, lust and . . . "other unbridled emotions that destroy the personality" (p. 267). He acknowledged the similarity of this idea to the classical greek notion of self-control to be for the purpose of producing a well-rounded personality, but noted the biblical perspective in which humans attain such control only as they rely more on God, rather than themselves.

The inner reality of "self-control" seems to reflect a sense of personal strength to be balanced, to be whole(some), to be healthy, to be holy or, to be righteous, as God is Righteous. The outer reality is to exercise self-discipline in the form of restraint from over-indulgence and discipline to persist in that which is healthy and good.

In consideration of the above, the following definition is offered:

Definition

Self-Control: Proceeds from the Spirit of God dwelling within, and one's personal experiencing of God's love, forgiveness, righteousness, and faithfulness. An exercise of self-restraint and self-discipline in order to live a lifestyle consistent with a spiritual purpose to bring glory and honour to God rather than to self through indulgence. To possess a balanced lifestyle that is sensible, practical, reasonable and healthy, without excesses.

These nine christian values, defined above, represent the basis for the development of the inventory items which were utilized in the construction of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory.

The following section will review some of the pertinent religiosity scales in the literature that are relevant to the Christian Lifestyle Inventory.

Religiosity Scales

Earlier Conceptions

There have been several attempts within psychology to identify different levels or types of religiousness. William James (1902) has often been attributed the distinction of being the first psychologist to seriously study religiosity in which he distinguished between "healthy minded" and "sick soul" converts. More recently, Allport and Ross (1967) provided a method for distinguishing between intrinsic and extrinsic forms of personal faith which Spilka, Hood, and Gorsuch (1985) have referred to as perhaps the most fruitful conception of personal faith to date. Allen and Spilka (1967) developed a similar conception that highlights the cognitive correlates of the intrinsic-extrinsic motivational factors of personal faith, which they termed *committed* and *consensual* orientations.

Allport and Ross (1967) were prompted to explore the issues of personal faith because of the overwhelming research evidence demonstrating that church attenders are more prejudiced than non-attenders, both toward ethnic groups and also ideological groups. Utilizing an intrinsic-extrinsic scale, they identified three different groups with differing degrees of prejudice. They defined the extrinsically motivated person as one who "uses" religion whereas the intrinsically motivated person "lives" religion. Persons with an extrinsic orientation tend to use religion for their own ends. They may find religion useful for a variety of reasons like providing security and solace, sociability and distraction, or status and self-justification. Their motivation is primarily exploitive. Intrinsically motivated people, on the other hand, find their master motive in religion. They tend to internalize their religion and follow it fully. It is in this sense that they live their religion.

In addition to finding some subjects that were consistently intrinsic, and others that were consistently extrinsic on their scale, they found another rather large group who persisted in endorsing any or all items that were worded favorably toward religion in any sense. They labelled this group indiscriminately proreligious. In comparing these three groups on measures of prejudice, they found the intrinsics to be the least prejudiced, the indiscriminately proreligious to be the most prejudiced and the extrinsics to be somewhere in between. Allport and Ross (1967) referred to Allport's earlier work (1950) in which he discussed the psychological tie between intrinsic orientation and tolerance and between the extrinsic orientation and prejudice as reflecting differences in cognitive styles. They extended their explanation to include the indiscriminately proreligious as well. Consequently, they made the point that it is not as important to know that a person is in some sense religious as it is to know the role religion plays in the economy of one's life.

Recent Scales

Several more recent surveys have emerged that have focused on the question of spiritual maturity. These include Ellison and Paloutzian's 1978 Existential/Spiritual Well-Being Scale (cited in Bassett, Camplin, Humphrey, Dorr, Biggs, Distaffen, Doxtator, Flaherty, Hunsberger, Poage, & Thompson, in press), the Shepherd Scale (Bassett et al., 1981), the Spiritual Maturity Index (Ellison, 1983), the Spiritual Leadership Qualities Inventory (Townsend & Wichern, 1984), the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Moberg, 1984), the Lifestyle Inventory (Maloney, 1986), and the Religious Status Interview (Malony, 1988).

Existential/Spiritual Well-Being Scale

Ellison and Paloutzian's Spiritual Well-Being Scale (cited in Bassett, et al., in press) contains 20 items in a Likert-like format. Ten of the items measure religious well-being and the other 10 reflect existential well-being. Ellison (1983) reported that factor analysis of the instrument, using varimax rotation, yielded three main factors. All of the items on the Religious Well-Being Subscale loaded on one factor and the Existential

Well-Being items loaded on two factors related to life direction and life satisfaction.

Spiritual Maturity Index

The Spiritual Maturity Index (Ellison, 1983) was developed to complement the Spiritual Well-Being Scale. It contains thirty items in Likert-like format designed to assess how much people have changed in their christian experience. Bassett et al. (in press) reported that some question had been raised about the meaningfulness of the distinction between spiritual well-being and spiritual maturity because of their strong positive correlation.

Shepherd Scale

The Shepherd Scale (Bassett et al., 1981) derived its 38 items from exegetical analysis of biblical descriptions of qualities of christian character organized into belief and lifestyle sections. Participants responded to each item on a 4-point scale ranging from "true" to "not true". The instrument demonstrated validity by separating self-proclaimed Christians from non-Christians. Factor analysis (Pecnik and Epperson, 1985) yielded two factors, one measuring christian beliefs, values, and behaviors and the other focused on identification with christian community.

The Spiritual Leadership Qualities Inventory

The Spiritual Leadership Qualities Inventory (Townsend & Wichern, 1984) was designed to measure church leadership traits based on scriptural descriptions of leadership qualities and was applicable to all people in leadership positions in churches. The scale consisted of 222 items identifying 19 traits of spiritual maturity. These traits included: (1) Upright, (2) Good Reputation, (3) Above Reproach, (4) Respectable, (5) Desire to be Overseer, (6) Holy, (7) Able to Teach, (8) Temperate, (9) Prudent, (10) Able to Manage Family, (11) Husband of One Wife, (12) Gentle, (13) Not Quick-Tempered, (14) Self-Controlled, (15) Not addicted to Wine, (16) Greed (not greedy), (17) Lover of Good, (18) Not Self-Willed, and (19) Hospitable. As predicted, the scale satisfactorily discriminated between church leaders and non-Christians but it failed to separate elders from deacons. It seemed to measure some degree of spiritual lifestyle. The scale is cumbersome because of its length.

Spiritual Well-Being Scale

Moberg's (1984) Spiritual Well-Being Scale consists of ten indexes or subscales that were originally developed from a questionnaire tested on 761 American subjects and 320 Swedish subjects. Seven of the ten indexes were derived from factor analysis which included: (1) Christian Faith (13 items), (2) Self-Satisfaction (9 items), (3) Personal Piety (6 items), (4) Subjective Spiritual Well-Being (5 items), (5) Optimism (4 items), (6) Religious Cynicism (3 items), and (7) Elitism (3 items). In addition, 19 items reflecting service activities were distributed between the three remaining indexes of (8) Political Involvement, (9) Religious Involvement, and (10) Charitable Involvement. Moberg reported that results from a subsequent survey indicated a high correlation of .73 between Ellison and Paloutzian's Existential Well-Being Scale and his Self-Satisfaction Index. Their Religious Well-Being scale correlated at .86 with his Christian Faith Index and .70 with Personal Piety. What is particularly interesting in the scale is its broad based multi-faceted conception of indicators of spiritual well-being.

Religious Status Interview

The Religious Status Interview (Malony, 1988) is based on the views of mature religion of William James (1902), Gordon Allport, (1950), and Orlo Strunk, Jr. (1965). The interview consists of 32 open ended questions covering the following eight categories: (a) Awareness of God, (b) acceptance of God's grace and steadfast love, (c) being repentant and responsible, (d) knowing God's leadership and direction, (e) involvement in organized religion, (f) experiencing fellowship, (g) being ethical, and (h) affirming openness in faith. Each response is scored by the interviewer on a 5-point scale. The author cites several studies showing adequate validity but unacceptable reliability, presumably because of the qualitative nature of the responses and poor inter-rater reliabilities.

Comparison Of Several Scales

Bassett, et al. (in press) compared several of the above instruments, which he referred to as measures of christian maturity, in order to identify the similarities and differences between them. They administered a modified paper and pencil version of the Religious Status Interview, the Shepherd Scale, the Existential/Spiritual Well-Being Scale, and the Spiritual Maturity Index to 242 catholic and protestant students attending a small christian liberal arts college. In order to tie their study to the broader literature on religious experience, they added a short measure of intrinsic faith (Hoge, 1972).

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients indicated all of the scales were significantly and positively related to each other. With the exception of the Existential Well-Being subscale, all other scales had correlations ranging from .71 to .91 suggesting the surveys have convergent validity. The participants were also asked to indicate the importance of their relationship to God on a 6-point scale. The surveys accounted for 73% of the variance in predicting "importance" using a step-wise regression procedure, though the Religious Well-Being subscale alone, was able to account for 66% of the variance.

Factor analysis was also completed on each of the surveys. The Religious Status Interview yielded four factors: (a) committed faith manifested in a personal relationship with God, (b) faith demonstrated in spiritual growth and social concern, (c) self-esteem rooted in the ability to give and receive forgiveness, and (d) personal responsibility in the context of a relationship with God. Consistent with previous reports, the Existential/Spiritual Well-Being Scale yielded three factors. The first measured committed faith, and the second and third loaded on life direction and life satisfaction from the Existential Well-Being subscale. The Spiritual Maturity Index indicated two factors with the first measuring committed or intrinsic faith and the second incorporated the following ideas: (a) an acceptance of people who have different ideas, (b) a rejection of the idea that only things done as part of following Christ matter, and (c) a rejection of the idea that a person was having less consistent victories over temptation than before. The Shepherd Scale indicated three factors. The first measured committed faith, the second reflected how the person responded to others, and the third measured christian growth.

Finally, they collapsed the surveys, excluding the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale and the Existential Well-Being subscale and performed an exploratory factor analysis, which yielded four factors: (a) the extent to which personal commitment was lived out in a person's life, (2) the extent to which personal commitment was manifest in belief, (c) how a person related to others, and (d) a person's perception of God as a protector and sustainer. They concluded from their study that each of the surveys appeared to primarily measure personal faith commitment and secondarily measure some other factor(s) relevant to christian experience. Given the good reliability and convergent validity of the scales, they felt that the secondary factors would likely determine which of the instruments a researcher may want to choose to use.

In a paper presented to the Eastern Region of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, Ellison (1987) included the preliminary version of the Christian Lifestyle Scale (Stensland, 1985) in a list of seven scales measuring christian maturity. While the primary purpose of the Christian Lifestyle Scale is to measure the extent to which christian values affect the lifestyles of people, it may be reasonable to assume that higher scores on the Christian Lifestyle Scale would correlate positively with measures of christian maturity.

Conceptually, however, the Christian Lifestyle Scale has a wider focus and broader application.

Christian Values Scales

Preliminary Christian Lifestyle Scale

The preliminary version of the Christian Lifestyle Scale (Stensland, 1985) was tested on a sample of 96 members of an conservative protestant church congregation. The internal consistency measures ranged from .65 to .85 for each of the nine subscales and a total scale level of .88. Construct validity for the definitions and the items within each subscale was enhanced by the utilization of an "expert" committee consisting of the Elder Board members of that congregation. One additional step was taken toward validation by empirically comparing the responses of the congregation with that of the Elder Board, who were considered the spiritual leaders of the congregation. The Elder Board scored slightly higher than the full congregation on eight of the nine subscales. Though the differences were in the desired direction, they were not statistically significant. The results of the preliminary study suggested that it is feasible to develop a scale to measure the extent to which christian values affect the lifestyle of people that is both valid and reliable. It was decided that further refinement of some of the weaker items would be required and that the scale be tested on a broader sample.

Maloney's Life Style Inventory

Further support for the feasibility and applicability of such a scale has been reported by Maloney (1986) in which a similar scale was developed and tested on a sample of 850 students in a christian liberal arts college in midwestern U.S.A. Correlation coefficients between subscales ranged from .32 to .60 with test-retest reliability coefficient correlations ranging from .59 to .82 with a total scale test-retest reliability coefficient of .97.

In comparing Maloney's Life Style Inventory with Stensland's preliminary Christian Lifestyle Scale (1985), certain differences are noteworthy. First, there were some apparent differences in the definitions of the values themselves. In addition, Maloney chose to eliminate a specific subscale for "love", using the rational that "love" was an overarching quality that was central to all of the subscales. Further, Maloney chose to combine the values of "kindness" and "goodness" into one single subscale. Another difference was in the response set. Participants were instructed to respond to the items in the scale using a 5-point Likert-like scale compared to a "true-false" format in the Christian Lifestyle Scale. Additionally, the items in the Life

Style Inventory were worded to describe specific real-life situations compared to a general statement of attitude or behavior which the participant was required to consider in the Christian Lifestyle Scale, though the participants in the Christian Lifestyle Scale were instructed to think of specific life situations from their own experience that applied to the statement. Finally, the sample populations were quite different, though each represented a fairly narrow homogeneous group. The Life Style Inventory sample consisted of college students whereas the Christian Lifestyle Scale sample consisted of a broad adult age range within the confines of one specific church congregation. The generalizability of the findings of either study beyond the population on which the scales were tested is limited because of their unique characteristics. In addition, it seemed that several of the items in the Life Style Inventory depicted real-life situations that reflected age and sex biased contexts. For example, "If my child spilled his milk, I would speak kindly in my discipline"; "If my friend became sexually aggressive, I would stop him and pray about the situation". Other items referred to situations in the work place, or driving a car which reflect situational biases since not all people work outside the home or drive cars.

While the similarities of these two scales lend support to the need and feasibility of developing such a scale, the differences between them were considered in the design of this project. Maloney (1986) indicated that further validation of his instrument would be required and that factor analysis would likely be useful.

Unique Characteristics

The Christian Lifestyle Inventory, which was previously named the Christian Lifestyle Scale, is conceptualized with a values oriented theoretical framework. The religiosity scales reviewed by this researcher are not conceptualized in that manner. That is not to say that other religiosity measures do not exist within the values oriented framework. The instrumental and terminal values presented by Rokeach (1969) or the Religious Scale of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Value (1960), for example, are clearly values oriented. However, there does not appear to be a religiosity scale, within the values oriented framework that is based on exegetical analysis of biblical descriptions of christian values that are placed within a scale designed to measure lifestyle. These are the unique features of this scale that reflect a gap in the available religiosity scales to date.

The preceding review of the literature explored relevant value theories and their relationship to the traditional view of virtues. It also included a detailed exegetical analysis of scripture which formed the basis for the definitions of the nine values of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. These nine values represent the nine content subscales of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory. In addition, the literature review covered some of the existing religiosity scales that were considered relevant to this research project.

The methodology and procedures detailed in the following chapter provide the basis for the test construction steps followed in the development of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory.

III. METHOD AND PROCEDURES

The procedures of this research project build upon the preliminary work carried out by Stensland (1985). The methodology of scale development in this study, particularly with respect to the content and empirical basis for item development and selection, is adapted from Jackson (1970, 1971). Three additional procedures designed to strengthen the validity of the scale were added. These included: (1) a panel of ordained pastors as experts to judge the congruence between each item and its designated category resulting in the elimination of twenty percent of the items prior to formal testing of the scale by the sample population, (2) exploratory factor analysis on the final items selected for the scale resulting from testing by the sample population to document and confirm the integrity of the scale, and (3) the administration of two external measures to document relatedness.

Construct Validation

In tracing the historical trends in the conception of validity in test construction since the 1950's, Messick (1987) highlighted the shift from conceiving content, criterion-related, and construct validity as separate entities to unifying them as simply different facets of the same process subsumed under the term construct validity. Accordingly, he defines validity as "an integrated evaluative judgement of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of inferences and actions based on test scores" (p. 1). Cronbach (1984) defined validity more generally as "the soundness and relevance of a proposed interpretation of scores" (p. 126). Both Messick and Cronbach agree that it is the inferences derived from test scores that is to be validated, not the test itself.

Furthermore, validity is a matter of degree, rather than an all or none fact. While highlighting the ongoing nature of the work, Messick differentiated the judgement from the process when he stated that ". . . validity is an evolving process and validation is a continuing process" (1987, p. 1).

Finally, validation is not a simple unidimensional process, but one which is varied and complex. As Messick put it, "To validate an interpretive inference is to determine the degree to which multiple lines of evidence are consonant with the inference . . ." (p. 2). Cronbach (1984) referred to construct validation as a ". . . lengthy--indeed, endless--process of revising hypotheses . . . ." that is . . . "a matter of asking tough questions about the test content and its correlates. For such a free-ranging program of analysis there is no simple or ideal design" (p. 134). So encompassing is the process of construct validation that Messick described it as "the integration of any evidence that bears on the interpretation or meaning of test scores" (1987), p. 10).

While the process of validation is complex and multi-faceted, it is not intended to be pursued in a haphazard or chaotic context. Loevenger (1967) described three broad components of construct validity that Messick (1987) supported and agreed that they collectively account for almost any form of construct validation with perhaps the exception of social consequence. These three aspects of the construct validation process are known as substantive, structural, and external. All of the procedures in this study are considered part of the construct validation process and will be presented under the appropriate component.

Substantive component

This component combines the content basis for item selection with the empirical basis for item selection (Loevenger, 1967).

Definitions for each of the nine values under consideration in this inventory were previously presented in this paper.

Item Development

A pool of approximately one hundred items for each of the nine values were originally generated in the preliminary study (Stensland, 1985). The items were designed to represent a range of the content domain specified by each definition. The thirty most representative items from each pool were selected and edited for inclusion in that preliminary scale on the basis of (a) representativeness of a range of the content domain of the value defined, (b) content saturation both with respect to substantive convergence of the value under consideration, and conceptual distinctiveness from each of the other irrelevant values in the whole scale, and (c) sources of response style variance including sex bias, age bias, item length, and item endorsement.

The preliminary scale (Stensland, 1985) was tested on a sample of 96 subjects from one conservative protestant church congregation. The twenty items in each scale yielding the strongest discriminant and convergent validity were retained, and formed the initial basis for item development in the current project. These 180 items were reviewed for further sources of response style variance and revised or replaced.

Item situation bias.

One of the unique considerations for item development in this project was to avoid situation specific items because of their potential bias. For example, not all people are employed outside the home, so items referring to the work place would not uniformly apply, or items referring to spouses or children would be inappropriate for some subjects and therefore create unwanted sources of variance. In order to facilitate the reliability of their responses, however, subjects were instructed to think of specific situations from their own life experiences that apply before responding to each item.

Item endorsement bias.

According to Jackson (1970, 1971), response style variance due to item endorsement has two predominant sources. The first is in response to positively versus negatively stated items which is controlled for in this project by balancing them with equal numbers of each. The second source of item endorsement variance results from conscious or unconscious efforts to present a "favorable" picture of self in the responses. The most common form of such variance is related to subjects' potential desire to present a "generally" favorable picture of themselves, which will be considered later in this section. Another form of such variance was subjectively observed in the preliminary project (Stensland, 1985) that seemed to be more specifically related to the tendency to present a "spiritual" or "religiously" favorable picture of self which seemed to occur most obviously in items which contained religious sounding words and phrases. Consequently, it was decided to eliminate all but the most general religiously sounding items from the scale.

Items were subsequently selected from the original pool and some new items were written to establish a new pool of twenty five items for each of the nine content subscales. These items were edited within the context of the above considerations and on the basis of (a) representativeness of a range of the content domain of the value defined, (b) content saturation both with respect to substantive convergence of the value under consideration, and conceptual distinctiveness from each of the other irrelevant values in the whole scale, and (c) sources of response style variance including sex bias, age bias, item length, and item endorsement.

Desirability subscale.

In addition to eliminating the religious sounding items in the scale to reduce item endorsement variance, a desirability scale was utilized to identify subjects whose responses were intended to create a favorable picture of themselves. Jackson's Personality Research Form AA (1965) includes a desirability scale with twenty items, some of which were adapted for this scale. Twelve of the twenty items could not be applied to this scale because they were too similar to the content scales of this inventory. Four of the items were used without modification; four were changed to accommodate the five-point Likert-like response format; and two entirely new items were written.

Infrequency subscale eliminated.

In addition to the nine content scales, an Infrequency Scale with twenty items adapted from the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1984) was included in the preliminary study (Stensland, 1985). It was designed to provide data on the reliability of the completed questionnaires. Its utilization, however, did not result in the elimination of any questionnaire that had been completed. Consequently, the Infrequency Scale was not included in this experimental version. Questionnaires in which more than ten percent of the items were incomplete were eliminated from the analysis, consistent with Bassett, et al. (in press).

Item-Subscale Congruence

The first phase of an empirical basis for item selection was pursued in order to document the level of confidence to place in item selection prior to submitting them for testing by the full research sample. In this phase, the items were tested for domain content utilizing an item-objective congruence procedure described by Hambleton (1984) and endorsed by Messick (1987). A panel of twelve ordained pastors from the nine christian denominations were selected for this Expert Judges Panel. Table One shows the distribution of pastors by denomination. One judge participated from each of the denominations with the exception of the Lutherans, who had two judges, and the Baptists, who had three judges.

Each Judge was provided with a letter describing the nature of their task, a copy of the definitions of each of the categories, and was personally briefed on each of the definitions by the researcher. A copy of the letter to the Judges is included in Appendix B. The items were arranged in random order together with ten "bogus" items which were actually the items from the "desirability subscale". The Expert Judges were instructed to judge in which of the ten categories each item belonged. The judges were told that some "bogus" items had been added to the list of items. The Experts were given one week to complete the task on their own time. The results were analyzed in terms of the number and percent accuracy that each item was identified with the intended category.

Experimental Edition

The twenty items in each of the nine categories with the strongest evidence of representative domain content were arranged in a questionnaire, similar in format to the Personality Research Form (Jackson,1984). The subject's response format was modified from the preliminary study from a "true-false" form to a five point Likert-like format in order to obtain more sensitive data. The five point scale included the following:

a = Definitely characteristic of me

b = Usually characteristic of me

c = Unsure if this is characteristic of me or not

d = Usually uncharacteristic of me

e = Definitely uncharacteristic of me

In addition to these 180 items in the nine content subscales, the 10 items in the Desirability Subscale, and the 10 items from the Hoge Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale were assembled into one questionnaire. This Experimental Edition of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory, as shown in Table C-1 in Appendix C, was distributed to the subjects in this study for testing. Appendix F contains the subject instructions accompanying that standard questionnaire package.

Sample Selection

The sample for this study consisted of people attending churches from several christian traditions representing a cross section of the conservative-liberal spectrum within the greater Edmonton area. Church groups represented in this study included Anglican, Baptist, Catholic, Christian and Missionary Alliance, Christian Reformed, Evangelical Free, Lutheran, Pentecostal, and United. A small number of subjects came from other christian affiliations including Church Of God, Congregational, Mennonite Brethren, and Seventh Day Adventists. Specific congregations/parishes to be included in the study were suggested by regional, district, and diocese church leaders on the basis of the perceived interest and likely support of the project by the specific congregation and pastor. Geographic location (central versus outlying), size, and educational and socioeconomic levels were given secondary consideration by the church leaders.

Two exceptions to the above approach were the Baptists and Christian and Missionary Alliance, because their district offices were not readily accessible. In the former case, a list of local Baptist churches was obtained and submitted to the three Baptist members of the expert judges committee used in the item-objective congruence phase of this study. These three judges were familiar with the churches on the list and were each asked to identify six churches they would recommend. In the latter case, all the local churches in the area were contacted directly.

In each case, the pastor of the church was contacted by phone to explain the nature of the study. In some cases, an informal agreement to participate was obtained immediately. In others, follow up in the form of a personal meeting or written material was provided. A formal "Agreement to Participate" was obtained from each of the churches involved. The other subjects in the study were people who were informally known to the researcher and willing to participate in the study.

Subject incentive.

In an effort to improve the church participation rates and the subject return rates, the subjects were told they could receive a profile of their own personal results on this scale in comparison with all the other subjects in the study. This was an optional program and the subjects indicated their desire for feedback on a check off form. It was made clear that their results would be kept confidential and returned to their church in individually sealed envelopes with their subject identification number written on the outside. They were also instructed to keep track of their own identification number in order to be able to obtain the appropriate sealed envelope from the church office.

The completed questionnaires were scored by means of National Computer Systems General Purpose Answer Sheets, Form No. 4521 and a National Computing Systems Sentry Optical Reading System.

Item Analysis

In order to pursue the second phase of the empirical basis for item selection the responses of the subjects were analyzed as follows:

1. Frequency distribution of subject response for each item, in order to eliminate those items in which 95

percent or more of the subjects responded the same way. Such items do not discriminate between individuals and therefore offer insufficient informational value (Jackson, 1970).

2. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated between each item and the nine content subscales in order to determine the convergent relatedness of the item to its intended subscale and its divergent relatedness to the other subscales. Those items which correlated higher in a subscale other than the originally intended one were reviewed. If the item was seen to "fit" with the construct of the other category, it was re-keyed. If it did not appear to contribute to the definition of the construct under consideration, it was discarded. Those items which yielded the lowest correlations with their intended subscales were also eliminated.

3. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated between each of the subscales and also between the subscales and the total scale score in order to document their relatedness.

4. Principal Components Factor Analysis was employed at this stage to determine the underlying dimensions or factors within the nine content subscales of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory.

The function of factor analysis in this context was confirmational in that scale development from the outset of this endeavor was based on the conception of nine discreet christian values. Every effort was made to develop items that fit within the content domain of each of the categories under consideration. The possibility of some evidence of mutuality between subscales was recognized. In fact, the construct itself implies a clear element of mutuality in that the term "Fruit" is singular and each of the nine manifestations of it are simply different facets of it. Therefore, a balance between independence of scales and integration of constructs was expected. Factor analysis was applied at this stage to explore the extent to which the intended model was achieved. Since the sample size was insufficient to allow a formal confirmatory factor analysis, an exploratory approach was utilized.

Structural component

This component refers to the extent to which structural relations between test items parallel the structural relations of other manifestations of the trait being measured (Messick, 1987). It is this component that incorporates homogeneity and test-retest reliability. Loevenger (1967) identified three optional structural models that apply: (a) Cumulative models which differentiate people with respect to degree, (b) Class models which differentiate people with respect to kind, and (c) Dynamic models which identify intra-test and inter-test scatter patterns.

The Christian Lifestyle Inventory fits within the definition of a cumulative model since the score is cumulative and differentiates people on the basis of degree. Furthermore, the range of life situations implied in the items for each subscale were designed to reflect a representative range of non-test behaviors and attitudes in the real world.

Statistical Analysis

The responses of the subjects were statistically analyzed as follows:

1. Alpha correlations of internal consistency for each subscale.

2. Mean score and standard deviation of the group for each subscale and for the total scale.

External Component

In this component, the meaning of the test scores is substantiated externally by appraising the degree to which empirical relationships with other measures, or lack thereof, are consistent with that meaning (Messick, 1987). This component includes concurrent and predictive correlates and comparisons across groups, settings, and experimental interventions (Loevenger, 1967).

Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale

One of two outside measures to be incorporated into this study was a short version (Hoge, 1972) of a measure of intrinsic faith developed by Allport and Ross (1967). The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972) was included in a comparison of several measures of religiosity carried out by Bassett, et al. (in press). They reported that factor analysis of the scale found it to measure christian commitment.

The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972) is included in Table C-2 in Appendix C. This ten-item scale was administered to all subjects in the study. The items were systematically distributed throughout the two hundred item experimental Christian Lifestyle Inventory questionnaire. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated between the total score of the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972) and the score of each subscale and the total score of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory to determine the direction and extent of their relatedness.

Insight.

The second outside measure included in this study was to administer *Insight* (Hall, 1990) to twenty percent of the subjects in order to compare its relatedness to the Christian Lifestyle Inventory. *Insight* is a broad based values inventory based on the Hall-Tonna Inventory of Values (1985). It is conceptually consistent with the earlier inventory but is considered more appropriate for research purposes because it utilizes all of the one hundred twenty five discreet values of the theory rather than only the fifty clusters of values utilized in the Hall-Tonna Inventory of Values. Secondly, the earlier inventory reported results along a seven-cycle continuum whereas *Insight* reports its results utilizing a nineteen category scale yielding more discreet finer discriminations in reported scores. *Insight* was randomly assigned to subjects by including it in every fifth questionnaire package distributed. The subjects were not aware of the extra one hundred twenty five item questionnaire until after it had been assigned to them. Appendix G contains the subject instructions provided with the packages that included the extra *Insight* questionnaire. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated between the total score of *Insight* and the total score of each subscale and the total score of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory to determine the direction and extent of their relatedness.

Comparison Of Group Differences

In addition to the above considerations, One Way Analysis of Variance utilizing the Scheffe Multiple Comparisons Test was carried out to determine statistically significant differences among the independent variables identified in this study. These variables included sex, age, education, marital and family status, occupational groups, income levels, church denomination and frequency of church attendance. The Scheffe Multiple Comparisons Test was selected because post hoc comparisons were required that included all possible simple and complex contrasts. Furthermore, The Scheffe Multiple Comparisons Test is considered fairly conservative, and provides relatively good protection against Type-I error (Glass & Hopkins, 1984).

Limitations and Implications

The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. This study is limited to developing a scale to measure the extent to which these nine specific christian values influence the lifestyles of people, using standard test construction procedures including documentation of reliability and validity measures. It is beyond the scope of this study to develop a normative database, either for a general population or any subgroup within the general population.

2. This scale is not intended to measure how "religious", "spiritual", or even "Christian" a person or group of people may be. Rather, it is intended only to measure the extent to which these christian values influence or are manifest in the lifestyles of people. Therefore, this paper will not attempt to define what is

meant by "religion", "spirituality", and "Christianity" beyond specifying definitions of the values under consideration.

3. This paper recognizes that the nine specific values under consideration here are not the only values operative in the lives of people. It acknowledges that many other values impact the lifestyles of people, some of which are complementary, some conflicting, and some inconsequential to these values. This study makes no effort to account for them.

4. The purpose and nature of this research is test construction. Its focus is on the evaluation of the items in the scale in the context of test construction work rather than on the evaluation of the subjects per se. Although a "Subject Incentive Component" which provided feedback to subjects requesting it was included, any assessment of individuals or groups of people in the form of clinical or research application of this scale is beyond the scope of this particular research project.

5. The use of church attenders as subjects in this study was utilized because of accessibility. A general population was preferable but not feasible within the resource limitations of the study. Consequently, the resulting data will yield results that may not be generalizable beyond the characteristics of subjects involved in this study.

6. It is recognized that the "confirmatory" factor analysis was completed on the same sample as those that completed the original questionnaires. While that does provide useful information, it is considered a limitation of this study since such data gathered on a different sample would provide a basis for more confident interpretations of test results.

7. It is recognized that this scale does not measure the actual lived performance of christian lifestyle but only measures what people report about their lifestyle. Therefore, the validity and reliability indicators of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory are limited to this self-report measure of lifestyle.

8. Messick (1987) identified the following six general categories in which evidence of construct validity can be obtained: (a) Content of a test in relation to content of the domain of reference, (b) probing ways individuals respond to items, (c) examining relationships among responses to test items, (d) surveying relationships of the test scores with other relevant measures, (e) investigating differences in test processes and structures over time, across groups, across settings and in response to experimental interventions, and (f) tracing the social consequences of interpreting test scores in particular ways. It should be noted that some attempt has been made to document construct validity

in all but the last category above. The efforts in this study to document evidences of construct validation are considerable but are only a small beginning in the unending process of clarifying the validation of this scale.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results and discussion of this study will be presented within the same context of construct validation as the preceding chapter. Consequently, information pertaining to item selection, research sample description, the results of item analysis in terms of frequency distributions and relatedness to subscales, the correlations between subscales, and results of factor analysis will be presented under the heading of the Substantive Component. Results pertaining to internal consistency and mean scores and standard deviations of the entire sample will be presented in the Structural Component section. The relatedness of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory to the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale and *Insight* will be presented in the External Component section. Statistical analysis for this project utilized SPSS-X: Version 3 (SPSS, 1988).

Substantive Component

This component combines the content basis for item selection with the empirical basis for item selection (Loevenger, 1967). The content basis for item selection was described in the previous chapter.

Item-Subscale Congruence

Table A-1 in Appendix A provides the list of the randomized items by category that were included in the item objective congruence procedure. An Expert panel of ordained pastors representing the nine different church groups from which the sample was drawn were required to judge in which category each randomly presented item belonged. It can be observed that those items in Table A-1 that are preceded by an "*" wer rejected, those that are preceded by "**" were re-keyed to another category, and those preceded by "***" were modified prior to inclusion in the experimental questionnaire. In addition, the outcome of the item objective congruence judgements are summarized in parentheses following each item, indicating the category the majority of the judges selected for the item and the percentage of agreement of judgements with the original key.

Table Two shows the number and percent of agreement of each Expert Judge with the Key for each item. It can be seen that the percentage of accuracy ranged from a high of 65.5 percent for one Judge to a low of 32.8 percent for another, with an mean of 52.0 percent for all 12 Judges. While these figures may appear somewhat low, they are not surprising, given the nature of the task. These judgements are extremely difficult because of the interrelatedness of the subscales. For example, Table 14 shows the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between individual items and the subscales. Item #166 from the Faithfulness Subscale states: "My personal integrity and honesty is not as consistent as my friends think it is" (Reversed Scored). This item correlated at .52 with Faithfulness, but also correlated moderately with Self-Control at .36 and with Peace at .35. Making judgements about the most appropriate category, when more than one category obviously applies, is very difficult. The task was made even more difficult by including "bogus" items which were very similar to the content items.

Item selection for the experimental version of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory was determined in three stages. The first stage selected those items in which the majority of judges were in agreement with the "keyed" categories. The second stage selected items on a descending order of agreement of Expert judgements of the items with its "keyed" category. The third stage resulted in the decision to "move" or "re-key" five items because of a high degree of agreement among the judges. Table A-2 in Appendix A shows the degree of agreement between the Expert Panel Judgements and the "Key" for each item, which formed the basis for the above decisions. Twenty percent (45 items) were eliminated from the scale, and five items were "re-keyed" to a more appropriate category at this stage. The decision to re-key an item was based on a high degree of agreement among the judges and that the content of the item "fit" with the construct of the new subscale.

The remaining "experimental" items were assigned new numbers and placed in a questionnaire format in preparation for distribution and testing on the 686 subjects in this study.

Subject Participation Information

This section will include three kinds of information. The first category pertains to participation rates of individual churches within their respective denominational groups; the second category provides information on questionnaire return rates; and the third category includes detailed demographical information.

Church Participation Rates

The church group denominations utilized in this study were selected on the basis of their varied christian tradition and heritage, their distribution across a conservative - liberal continuum and accessability. Initially, personal meetings were arranged with the district level church leaders in six of the nine groups, which included Anglican, Catholic, Evangelical Free, Lutheran, Pentecostal, and United. The purpose of those initial meetings was to obtain an endorsement of the project and to identify specific churches as potential prospects for obtaining subjects for the study. Appendix D includes a copy of the letter sent to the district church leaders explaining the purpose of this researcher's contact with them. All of the district level church leaders showed an interest in the project and actively expressed their endorsement of it. For the most part, the churches specified by them, were identified primarily on the basis of their perceived interest in such a project and secondarily on the basis of their distribution across socioeconomic and geographical spectrums. Direct contact with district level church leaders for the other three denominations was not feasible. In one case, the individual was out of the country for an extended period of time, and in the other two denominations, the district offices were in another city. In the former case, this researcher met with one of the local well respected pastors in the denomination, who served in the same capacity as the other district leaders. In another denomination, this researcher obtained a list of prospective churches from a panel of three respected pastors from that denomination. In the other denomination, this researcher contacted all of the local churches for that denomination directly.

Table Three provides information on the number of churches contacted and the resulting participation rates for each denomination. As shown, of the 68 churches initially contacted, the overall participation rate was 73.5 percent. Out of the 18 churches that did not participate, 15 declined because of other commitments and three initially agreed to participate in the study but failed to complete any questionnaires.

Several factors seemed to contribute to this high rate of participation and include: the initial endorsement of the project by the district level church leaders, specific congregations suggested on the basis of their perceived interest in the project, direct personal contact with the individual pastors by the researcher, and the subject incentive option which offered confidential feedback to individual subjects on the outcome on the scale.

Subject Return Rates

Table Four shows the overall subject return rates by denominations. A total of 956 questionnaires were distributed through the 53 churches that agreed to participate in the study of which 697 were returned yielding an overall return rate of 72.9 percent. Of the 697 that were returned, 11 were incomplete and could not be used.

The overall return rate of 72.9 percent is considered respectable in most research projects involving questionnaires, particularly in cases where an average of 1.5 to 2 hours of time is required. No information was available to document return rates in churches in other research projects of this nature, however, compared to the 47 percent return rate in the preliminary study (Stensland, 1985) this represents a good showing. In addition to the reasons given in the previous section on church participation rates which also seem to apply to this high rate of return, it seemed apparent, at least from a subjective point of view, that the return rates were usually higher in churches where the enthusiasm of the pastor for the project was greater.

Sample Description

Denomination distribution.

Table Five shows the portion of subjects obtained from the various denominations involved in this study. The largest group were from the Baptists which comprised 19.7% of the total sample. The smallest group represented was the Evangelical Free with 4.4% of the sample. The 13 individuals in the "other" category, representing 1.9% of the sample included two represented the Seventh Day Adventists, one was from a Congregational church, four were Mennonite, two were from the Church Of God, and four were unrecorded.

The most obvious aberration in the above proportions is the high number of Baptists in the study. Part of the reason for such high participation is reflected in the personal connections this researcher has with the Baptist churches in the Edmonton area and secondly it likely reflects a relatively high interest rate in this project among the Baptist pastors generally. Another aberrant observation is the relatively low proportion of Catholics and United Church numbers compared to their representation in the general public which Bibby (1987) documented to be approximately 50 percent and 16 percent respectively. The limitation, in this case, seems to be related to the number of churches contacted initially. In order to have achieved a higher proportion of subjects from those denominations, more churches would have been necessary since the return rates in Table 4 are close to average for the entire sample.

Age distribution.

Table Six shows the distribution of age for each denomination. The range for the entire sample was from 17 to 81 years with a mean of 43.0 years and a median of 42.0 years. The United church group yielded the highest mean age of 52.2 years and the Evangelical Free had the lowest age group with a mean of 33.2 years.

Although there is little information available to compare age distributions for different church denominations, it is clear that a mean of 43 years and a range from 17 - 81 years represents a good cross section of the adult population in the community.

Sex distribution.

Table Seven shows the sex distribution of the sample. The overall distribution was 62.5% female and 34% male with 3.5% unrecorded. Females represented the greater proportion in all church groups though it was greatest in the United and Lutheran groups. The most evenly distributed proportions were in the Christian Reformed and Christian & Missionary Alliance groups.

Marital status.

Table Eight provides information on the marital status of the subjects in the sample. Approximately three-quarters of the sample were married. Close to fourteen percent were single with the remaining twelve percent divided among the five other categories including 2.2% unrecorded.

Occupations.

Table Nine presents the occupations of the sample. The largest group were professionally trained people such as managers, teachers and nurses who represented 29.6 percent of the sample. The second largest group were homemakers who made up 22.5 percent of the sample. Less than one percent of the sample were unemployed and slightly over three percent were students.

Income levels.

Table Ten is a summary of the income levels of people in the sample. The largest proportion of the sample, which was 36.7 percent, reported gross annual income levels within the $20,000 - $39,999 range followed closely by 33.8 percent reporting incomes in the $0 - $19,999 range.

Church attendance.

Table 11 summarizes the number of church functions attended in an average month by the people in the sample. The mean number for the sample was 6.7 events per month. It is interesting to note that the most frequently identified number was nine or more times per month in seven of the groups and four times per month in the other three groups. It should be noted that the answer sheet did not allow for recording more than nine events. Several individuals commented that they attended more than nine times per month. These "average" figures, therefore, are under-estimated. According to these data, the Christian Reformed group had the highest church attendance rates and the Anglican group had the lowest.

Education.

Table 12 describes the number of years of education of the sample. Forty five percent had completed twelve years or less of education, 23.5% had completed one to three years of post secondary education, and 31.5% had completed at least sixteen years of education. The mean for the entire sample was 13.5 years of education completed.

The question of representativeness of this sample is a difficult one to determine because of a lack of demographic information on church attenders in the literature. The broad range of distribution for age, marital and family status, occupation groups and income levels may, at least, imply acceptable representativeness of church attenders among the groups under consideration. No information was found that would allow a judgement of the representativeness of frequency of church attendance for this sample. In terms of educational background, a mean of 13.5 years of education completed for this sample is consistent with the sample reported by Boivin, et al. (1990) of 102 subjects from four different churches which ranged from a mean of 12.9 years to 14.9 years of education completed. In terms of the sex distribution of this sample, the 62.5 percent female proportion seemed quite high. An informal poll of the actual church attendance figures in 19 of the churches in this sample yielded an estimated proportion of 56.5 percent female on a typical Sunday morning service in January. A formal test of proportional differences could not be carried out because of the limited sample and estimations of proportions involved, but it appears likely that a slight overrepresentation of females is present in this sample.

Empirical Basis For Item Selection

Appendix C contains the items included in the experimental version tested by the sample of 686 subjects. Table C-1 lists the items in the format of the questionnaire that was distributed to the subjects for testing. Table C-2 lists the same items by their assigned categories. Table C-3 lists the final items selected for this scale resulting from the item analysis.

Initial Considerations

Two initial considerations were addressed prior to examining the correlations between items and subscales. The first consideration was to evaluate the presence of invalid responses due to desirability factors. The second was to examine the frequency distribution of responses to each item in order to eliminate those items with minimal informational value.

Desirability concerns.

Scattergrams were plotted for each of the nine content domains with the Desirability Subscale for the entire sample and for each denomination. No evidence was found that suggested invalid responses due to desirability factors, consequently, no subjects were eliminated from the sample.

Exploratory Principal Components Factor Analysis was utilized using a Varimax Rotation to initially assess the number and nature of independent factors in this scale.

Initially, in keeping with the construct of nine content domains plus the desirability subscale, the number of factors was preset at ten. A informal scree test suggested ten factors, though an examination of the rotated matrix yielded evidence of only eight factors. All nine content domains were accounted for, though two of them collapsed into one factor. Loadings for items in the Desirability Subscale were not evident within the range of the first ten factors. The Communality values for the Desirability Items, as shown in Table 13, were found to be low and it was concluded that the Desirability Subscale was not represented in this solution. Subsequent evaluation of the Alpha level for the Desirability Subscale, as shown in Table 15 yielded .28. It was concluded that the Desirability Subscale did not yield evidence of adequate validity or reliability.

The previous chapter described the content of the Desirability Subscale. It will be recalled that twelve of Jackson's (1965) original desirability items were unacceptable because they were too similar in content to the items in some of the content subscales, and four of the remaining eight were modified to accommodate the five-point Likert-like response format for the current questionnaire. Two new and completely untested items were developed and included in this limited ten-item Desirability Subscale. It appears quite clear that this particular subscale failed to serve in its intended function of identifying subjects presenting unrealistically favorable pictures of themselves. It raises the question of whether any desirability subscale could be devised for this kind of an instrument, since most of the items in the entire scale measure values that by most peoples' standards are likely to be considered desirable in themselves.

Low information value items.

The second preliminary consideration was to examine the frequency distribution of responses to each item in order to eliminate those items with minimal informational value. Jackson (1970) recommended that any items which yielded *p* values below .05 or above .95, or in other words, that yielded the same response by more than 95 percent of the subjects, should be discarded on the basis its small variance and hence, limited informational value. Item analysis did not show any items yielding response rates in either of these two extreme ranges, consequently no items were eliminated.

Item Selection

The primary process of item selection was based on the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between test items and the nine content subscales. Those items which yielded the highest convergent correlations with their intended or "keyed" subscale were kept. Those items which correlated higher in a subscale other than the intended one were reviewed. If the item was seen to "fit" with the construct of the other category, it was "re-keyed". If it did not appear to contribute to the definition of the construct under consideration, it was discarded. Those items which yielded the lowest correlations with their "keyed" subscale were also eliminated. Table 14 shows the final items and their correlations with the subscales. Correlations below .20 are not shown.

The item analysis resulted in discarding 30 items which represented 16.7 percent of the 180 items tested on the sample, leaving 150 items in the Final Edition of the inventory. Nine of these final items had been re-keyed. Table C-3 in Appendix C provides a listing of these final items and indicates the originating subscale source for those items that were re-keyed.

The re-keyed items were of particular interest to this project in that they seemed to contribute to the refinement of the construct for the subscale under consideration. It will be recalled from the previous chapter that items were re-keyed when they correlated higher on another subscale and also "fit" or contributed to the construct of the new subscale. If the item was not seen to contribute to the construct of the higher correlated subscale, the item was discarded. The following examples from the Gentleness subscale illustrate the process dramatically:

ADDED ITEMS:

73. I love a celebration. (from Joy)

125. People like to be around me. (from Joy)

107. I'm good at resolving my conflicts with others. (from Peace)

160. I like celebrating people's accomplishments with them. (from Love)

MOVED OUT ITEMS:

102. My sense of self-worth is low.(R) (to Peace)

The emphasis of the definition of Gentleness was intended to be on the effect one has with others as described in the following statement from the definition: "Intimacy, transparency, vulnerability and a sensitive thoughtfulness are characteristic of relationships with others. . . a benevolent friendliness, a sensitive gracious action toward others without concern for oneself." The underlying factor contributing to this ability to *be there for others* was specified in the definition as follows : "A quality of strength, so confident of one's own self-worth and acceptance because of God's love and forgiveness that defensiveness and aggressiveness are unnecessary." Item #102 dealing with self-worth had its focus in how an individual views oneself, which obviously contributes to one's sense of "well-being" and harmony, as specified in the definition for Peace, whereas items #73, #107, #125, and #160 reflect the individuals affect on others which has its focus on how other see the individual. Similar observations were made for the other four re-keyed items in the scale.

A second noteworthy observation was that several items were kept even though their correlations were of similar magnitude on more than one subscale as can be seen for items #112 in Faithfulness, #14 and #122 in Gentleness, #4 in Self-Control, #17 and #83 in Love, #106 and #197, and #86 in Patience. These items were kept because they clearly contribute to the constructs in which they yielded higher correlations. While it is desirable in test construction to obtain sufficient divergent relatedness between items and the other subscales (Jackson, 1970, 1971), it is not necessary that complete independence of scales is achieved. In fact, in this scale the construct implies some degree of overlap. The extent to which a balance between independence of scale and construct integrity has been achieved is documented in the Alpha values for internal consistency, the correlations between subscales, and the number and nature of factors identified in factor analysis, which is presented and discussed in the following section.

Structural Component

Internal Consistency

Table 15 shows Alpha levels for each of the content subscales in the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and the Desirability Subscale. It also provides the Alpha level for the Hoge Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale.

The Alpha reliabilities fell within the range from .87 to .76, with the exception of the Love subscale which yielded .68. While these levels are not as high as those reported by Bassett, et al. (in press) which ranged from .85 to .95 for seven different instruments, these levels are generally within a range that is acceptable. The lower value on the Love scale is reflective of the variety or range of items that fall within the content domain of that construct. In reviewing the definition for love, it can be seen that it includes concepts of unconditional acceptance of all others, a concern for the well-being of others, and a willingness to share the joy and sorrow of others. This definition covers considerable distance in its domain and not only includes items dealing with compassion and concern for the well-being of others, but also includes a variety of indicators of prejudice and narrow, rigid, judgemental attitudes toward others. Furthermore, it is clear that Love serves as an overarching value for all of the other categories within the scale (Stamm, 1953, Buttrick, 1962, Cole, 1974). This idea was so strong, that Maloney (1986) chose to eliminate it as a separate subscale in his inventory. Given these considerations, it is not surprising that this subscale would have the lowest internal consistency in the inventory. It is this writers impression, however, that it is preferable to accept a somewhat lower reliability in this subscale than to be unable to sample the content of the items that it allows. The overall usefulness of the scale is enhanced by its inclusion.

Subscale Relatedness

Mutuality Of Subscales

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between subscales are shown in Table 16. The correlation coefficients fell within a range of .20 between Goodness and Patience and .71 between Joy and Peace. It is noted that seven out of the possible 36 subscale comparisons indicated correlation coefficients between .50 and .71. While these correlations are fairly high, evidence of independence of the subscales is still to be considered further in reviewing the results of factor analysis. The correlation of .71 between Joy and Peace is particularly high. However, closer examination of the item correlations in Table 14 shows a directional bias between the two subscales. Where the item correlates high on Joy, it is not as likely to correlate as high on Peace as the reverse direction does. In other words, according to this data, a high value for Joy does not follow with a high value for Peace as much as a high value for Peace predicts a high value for Joy. If one's Peace level is high, one's Joy level will be almost as high, however, if one's Joy level is high, one's Peace level is not necessarily as high. One's Joy level is more dependent on one's Peace level than the reverse.

Independence Of Subscales

The initial Principal Components factor analysis was pursued utilizing both the orthogonal and oblique rotations in order to obtain the Factor Correlation Matrix to determine the relatedness of the factors. Orthogonal rotation is utilized for uncorrelated factors and oblique rotations are appropriate for correlated factors. An informal scree test suggested ten factors were represented in the unrotated matrix. However, an earlier run had demonstrated that the desirability items were not represented in the solution and consequently, nine factors were allowed.

Table 17 shows the correlations between the factors from the oblique rotation Factor Correlation Matrix. The factor correlations clearly support the notion that a satisfactory level of independence between subscales has been achieved. Only three out of a possible thirty six combinations yielded correlations above .20 and the highest was only .24. The second conclusion that can be made from these data is that an Orthogonal Varimax rotation is appropriate for determining the factor loadings of the items, which are presented in Table 18.

Factor Analysis

The purpose of utilizing Principal Components factor analysis in this context is to test the hypotheses about the structure of the variables in this inventory by means of exploring the number and nature of constructs or "factors" that explain the correlations among a set of variables. In the preceding sections, the steps and outcomes were described that were based on following a predetermined model and developing and selecting items that "fit" that model. In exploratory factor analysis, the model is not predetermined. The procedure independently determines the number of underlying dimensions required to represent a set of variables or test items. If the number of dimensions matches the model, it serves to confirm the model in a substantial way.

The first and foremost observation to be made from the factor loadings is that the items in this scale are represented by eight factors. All of the subscales are represented by a separate factor with the exception of Joy and Peace which both loaded on the first factor. Therefore, the model seems to be confirmed for eight out of nine subscales. A closer examination shows clearly that Peace is the stronger of the two subscales with 100.0 percent of its items loading highest on the first factor, whereas only 50.0 percent of the Joy items loaded highest on the first factor. The remaining items scattered throughout five other factors, with three of them loading highest on Gentleness.

A second observation to be made from these factor loadings is that several of the loadings are relatively low and, in fact, would not be retained if factor loadings were being used as the basis of item selection. Since all of these items yielded their highest Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients on the keyed subscale, it is apparent that factor analysis is a far more sensitive process and would likely cut out too many items in a scale that is as integrated or correlated as this one. A second issue is that there is more than one "theme" within each construct. Factor analysis is designed to identify one predominant underlying "theme" or factor and, therefore, tended to yield low loadings for some items, even though they fit within the construct. Given the correlated model of this scale and the presence of more than one "theme" in the subscales, it appears that item selection based on their correlation coefficients with the subscales is a more appropriate choice than factor analysis for selecting items. However, this factor analysis solution is very useful in confirming the basic model and adding to the array of validation indicators that support this model.

Means And Standard Deviations

Table 19 provides the mean scores and standard deviations for the subscales and the total scale for the entire sample. The overall Total Scale mean score was 3.6993 with a standard deviation of .3353 and a range from a low mean score of 3.3366 and standard deviation of .6061 on Self-Control to a high of 4.2126 with a standard deviation of .3931 on Faithfulness. These scores yield satisfactory results in terms of the distribution they provide across the range available.

The preceding sections have detailed the results of this study in terms of the content and empirical basis for item selection, descriptions of the sample on which the scale was tested, indications of homogeneity and internal consistency of the scale, documentation of the relatedness of the subscales, and finally, the use of factor analysis to confirm the appropriateness of the model utilized in this scale. Now that the final items have been identified and documented, it is appropriate to shift attention away from item selection considerations and look at the relatedness of this scale to the other two instruments included in this study.

External Component

The External Component of construct validation includes comparisons across groups and encompasses evidence of concurrent and predictive correlates of the scale.

Relatedness To Other Instruments

In addition to the Christian Lifestyle Inventory, two additional, previously established, scales were administered to the test sample in order to document their relatedness. The ten-item *Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale* (Hoge, 1972), as shown in Table C-2 on page 237 in Appendix C, was imbedded within the experimental version of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and was administered to all subjects in the sample. Brian Hall's *Insight* (1990) was a separate scale of 125 items which was randomly assigned to every fifth subject in the study.

Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale

Table 65 shows the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the *Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale* and the Christian Lifestyle Inventory. The results indicate an overall correlation of .29 between the Total score on the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and a range from .12 with the Goodness Subscale to .28 on the Peace Subscale.

The correlations between these two instruments are considerably lower than expected. When Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated between the Total of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and the *Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale* for each of the denominations separately, however, a somewhat different view of the relatedness emerged. Table 66 shows the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the two scales for each denomination which yields a range from .27 to .49.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients in Tables 65 and 66 indicate that there is a positive correlation between the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale and the Christian Lifestyle Inventory, which is significant beyond the *p*.05 level, but that it is only weak to moderate in strength and shows a differential degree of relatedness between denominations.

Further evidence of a differential response to the *Intrinsic Religious Motivational Scale* by denomination was seen in the mean scores. One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between subjects in the nine different church denominations in this study. Table 67 shows the means score differences between denominations and indicates that significant differences at the *p*.05 level occurred between people in the United Church and seven other denominations and between the Anglicans and two other denominations. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

One Way Analysis Of Variance was also performed on the mean score differences on the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale between subjects in the five groups differing in frequency of church attendance. These groups were defined on the basis of the number of church functions attended in an average month as follows: (1) 1 or less, (2) 2 - 3, (3) 4 - 6, (4) 7 - 8, and (5) 9 or more. Differences between the five groups, at the $p = .05$ level of significance, were evident, as shown in Table 68. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

The evidence clearly shows that those subjects that attend church more frequently also scored significantly higher on the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale. No statistically significant differences were found between the mean scores on the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale for the variables of sex, age, marital and family status, occupation or income level.

In reviewing the above information it is apparent that there is a differential response to the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale by denomination. Table 67 shows the mean scores, which consistently increase and are highest with the most conservative denominations and lowest with the mainline churches, with the exception of the Anglicans. It appears that the scores on this scale are related to those churches in which the terminology and concepts of the items in this scale are a familiar part of their milieu. Those churches in which such terminology and concepts are not emphasized do not score as high. This is particularly notable because there was no significant difference between these same denominations on their scores for seven of the nine subscales of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory. On the two that were significant, Goodness and Love, the mainline churches scored higher.

Bassett et al. (in press) did factor analysis in their comparison of several christian measures including the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale. They described the items that loaded on this factor as measuring "Christian Commitment". It appears from these data that the christian commitment referred to by Bassett was perhaps a commitment to familiar church terminology and doctrinal emphasis rather than to a christian lifestyle as reflected in these nine specific values under consideration in this study. These two instruments do not appear to be strongly related because, it seems, they are focused on different issues. The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale focuses on commitment to christian doctrine, as it is emphasized in more conservative churches, whereas the Christian Lifestyle Inventory focuses on the living out of christian values in the relationships of daily living.

This was a particularly unexpected finding in this study and previously unreported in the literature. One of the possible reasons for this unique finding may be related to the uniqueness of this particular scale in that it was specifically designed to have a minimum of religious terminology in it. Had the religious terminology been utilized, as it is in all of the other scales reviewed, it is likely that those subjects from more liberal mainline roots would not have scored as high, not because their lifestyle is not christian, but because the terminology would not fit with their experience.

In retrospect, the fact that the correlation coefficient between the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale is low is preferable, particularly with the evidence of the differential correlations between denominations. The validation of the scale is enhanced because the differential correlatations demonstrate that the Christian Lifestyle Inventory transcends denominational differences in doctrinal emphases and jargon and actually reflects or measures lifestyle that emanates from the nine christian values identified as the "Fruit Of The Spirit".

Insight

Table 69 shows the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between *Insight* and the Christian Lifestyle Inventory. The results yielded an overall correlation of .20 with the Total score on the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and a range from -.04 with the Patience Subscale to .32 with the Goodness Subscale.

The correlation coefficients between these two instruments are considerably lower than expected. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the Total of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and *Insight* for each of the denominations did not yield useful information because of inadequate sample size within the groups, as shown in Table 70.

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between groups on *Insight*. No statistically significant differences were found between denominations. Nor were the differences significant for frequency of church attendance, age, marital status, or income. Differences were found to be significant, however, at the $p = .05$ level for education and occupational groups as shown in Tables 71 and 72. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

The above findings suggests that people with at least 16 years of education score significantly higher on this instrument than those with less education. While there were significant differences within the whole range of occupational groups, no two groups were found to be significantly different. It is interesting to note that education was a significant contributor to higher scores on this instrument and was also found to be a significant contributor to higher mean scores on the Goodness Subscale of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory, and as one might expect, the correlation between them was higher than for any other Subscale.

It isn't particularly clear why the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and *Insight* did not correlate at a higher positive level. A cursory review of the items in *Insight*, in Appendix H perhaps suggests that the values explored in that scale are simply different from those in the Christian Lifestyle Inventory or perhaps that the items in the Christian Lifestyle Inventory do not span the same range along the developmental continuum suggested by Brian Hall's (1986) four world view levels. The higher, though moderate, relationship with the Goodness Subscale perhaps provides a hint in that the Goodness items reflect concepts of generosity, justice, moral uprightness, and having a positive effect through community involvement. Many of the items in *Insight* are related to educational and research efforts and involvement in social programs that benefit the local and global community.

The preceding information completes the reporting of construct validation data on the Christian Lifestyle Inventory. In addition to the above information, a number of interesting findings were documented between the various demographical groups within the sample of subjects for this study. The section that follows provides a detailed examination of the differences in mean scores between those groups.

Comparison of Group Differences

Independent variables identified for the test sample in this study included sex, age, education, marital and family status, occupational status, income levels, church affiliation, and frequency of church attendance. Differences in test scores for each of these variables will be considered for each of the subscales, or dependent variables in the scale.

Sex Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between men and women on the dependent variables in the sample and are shown in Tables 20 through 24. There were no statistically significant differences between mean scores for males and females on the Goodness, Self-Control, Joy, or Patience Subscales, nor for the overall Total Scale. Differences at the *p* = .05 level of significance were found, however, on the other subscales. Females scored significantly higher on the Faithfulness, Gentleness, Love, and Kindness subscales and Males scored significantly higher on the Peace Subscale. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

It is interesting to note that the subscales of Faithfulness, Gentleness, Love, and kindness, in which females scored higher are those in which personal relationships are particularly highlighted. The exception was for the Patience Subscale, which also involves personal relationships, in which men and women did not score significantly different. These general results indicating higher scores for those subscales in which personal relationships are highlighted seems to be in line with the work of Carol Gilligan (1982) who has so aptly described this relational priority of women. It is also interesting to note that males scored significantly higher on the Peace Subscale. It may not necessarily mean that males experience an exceptional amount of Peace, but perhaps that women may simply be experiencing less Peace than men. This may reflect potential anxiety associated with the changing roles of women, which are still in a state of flux, and perhaps, as Sandra Schneiders (1986) has pointed out, this is particularly applicable to the church context.

Age Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between age groups on the dependent variables in the sample. The age groupings were defined as follows: (1) under 20 years, (2) 20 - 29 years, (3) 30 - 39 years, (4) 40 - 49 years, (5) 50 - 59 years, (6) 60 - 69 years, and (7) 70 plus years. There were no statistically significant differences between mean scores for Faithfulness, Gentleness, Love, Patience, or Kindness Subscales. Differences as the $p = .05$ level of significance were found on the remaining subscales. People age 30 years and over scored significantly higher than those in the 20 - 29 year range on Goodness. People age 50 years and over also scored significantly higher than those in the 20 - 29 year range on Self-Control. Additionally, people in the 60 - 69 age group scored significantly higher than those in the 30 - 39 age range on Self-Control. People in the 50 - 59 year range scored significantly higher than those in the 20 - 39 year range on Joy and those over 70 years scored significantly higher than those in the 30 - 39 year range. On the Peace subscale, those in the 50 - 59 year range scored significantly higher than those in 20 - 39 year range. Finally, on the overall Total Scale, those people in the

50 - 59 year range scored significantly higher than those in the 20 - 39 year range and those people over 60 years scored significantly higher than those in the 20 - 29 year range. Tables 25 through 29 present the details of these differences. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

These results present a rather fascinating picture of the differences between groups based on age and clearly show that people above 50 years demonstrate significantly higher scores on this scale than those in the young adult age range. These results sound remarkably similar to the differences between Erikson's (1950) Generativity versus Stagnation stage compared with the early adult stages of Identity versus Role Confusion and Intimacy versus Isolation. It would appear that maturity, at least in so far as that is reflected in chronological age, plays a significant role in the extent to which these christian values influence the lifestyles of people. This observation seems to hold up whether we consider the maturity that Maslow (1968) describes in his self actualizing people, or the open and tested or quested flexibility of Gordon Allport's (1950) mature personality. Perhaps a more structured framework such as the five levels of Dabrowski's Positive Disintegration Theory described so thoroughly by William Hague (1986) in his *New Perspectives on Religious and Moral Development,* are appropriate here. Such development may also be reflected in Kohlberg's (1980) six stages of Moral Development or Fowler's (1981) six Stages of Faith Development, which are heavily rooted in cognitive developmental theory. The point of this discussion is that regardless of which particular theoretical framework one looks through, there is a movement forward in maturity that moves toward wholeness and unity in relationships and a broadening of perspective of life that William Hague considers to be impacted by religion on maturing individuals. He described religion in this context as:

> . . . a powerful consciousness that overcomes trivialities, brings figure out of ground giving that perspective on life and one's relationships with it that is the essence of religious experience. All that rises must converge. (Hague, 1986, p. 218)

In the light of the above findings, it strongly raises a question of the utility of research inquiring into maturity, spiritual or otherwise, that employs samples made up of young adult subjects. Clearly, the benefits of using a broad age range in this study has been demonstrated.

Educational Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between groups with differing levels of education on the dependent variables in the sample. The education groupings were defined by years of education completed: (1) 12 years or less, (2) 13 - 15 years, (3) 16 years or more. There were no statistically significant differences between mean scores for the Gentleness, Self-Control, Joy, Peace, Patience, or Kindness Subscales. Differences as the *p* = .05 level of significance were found on the remaining subscales. People with 16 or more years of education scored significantly higher than those with twelve years or less on the Goodness, Faithfulness, and Love Subscales, and on the overall Total Scale. Tables 30 through 33 display the details of these differences. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

Marital Status Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between subjects in six different marital status groups. These groups were defined as follows: (0) Single, (1) Married, (2) Widowed, (3) Separated, (4) Divorced, and (5) Common Law. There were no statistically significant differences between mean scores for the Faithfulness, Patience or Kindness Subscales. Differences as the *p* = .05 level of significance were found on the remaining subscales. While significant differences were found within the whole range of marital status groups for the Gentleness and Joy Subscales, no two groups were found to be significantly different, which is perhaps a reflection of the conservative nature of the Scheffe Multiple Comparison Test. People who had lost a spouse through death had significantly higher scores on the Goodness Subscale than those who were separated. Both the widowed and married groups scored significantly higher than the singles on the Goodness and Self-Control Subscales. People who were divorced scored significantly higher than single people on the Love Subscale, and married people scored significantly higher than those that were separated on the Peace Subscale. Finally, on the overall Total Scale, the married, widowed, and separated subjects scored significantly higher than those in the single group. Tables 34 through 40 show the details of these differences. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

These findings are interesting in their variety which likely reflect both life circumstance and maturity of people. For example, People who have lost a spouse through death scored higher on Goodness than those who are separated. This may reflect greater community involvement because of age wherein many widowed people are retired and have the time and need to be involved in their communities more than separated people who are likely to be younger, perhaps with jobs and children to manage that keep them very busy. Both the widowed and married groups scored higher than the single group on

Goodness and Self-Control. It seems likely, given the strong relationship between age and scores on both Goodness and Self-Control that maturity is reflected in these differences. Furthermore, single people have not had the experiences of daily commitment to the care of children which requires more Self-Control and frequently involves significant community involvement in their children's activities. The Love Subscale is strongly loaded with items that measure acceptance of others and the significant differences between people who are divorced and those that are single may reflect that divorced people may have had to come to terms with their own rejection, perhaps particularly within the context of the church, and are therefore more accepting of other people. A secondary factor may again be that of maturity since the divorced group as a whole is likely to be somewhat older than the singles group.

The significantly higher score for those that are married than separated people on the Peace Subscale likely reflects the personal turmoil and uncertainty of separated people who have not yet resolved the final outcome of their marriage status. Finally, the higher scores for the married, widowed, and divorced groups over the single group on the overall Total Scale likely reflects a variety of influences discussed above including that of maturity through age.

Family Status Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between subjects with children and subjects with no children. There were no statistically significant differences between mean scores for the Love or Patience Subscales. Differences as the *p* = .05 level of significance were found on all of the remaining subscales, and on the overall Total Scale. Tables 41 through 48 display the details of these differences. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

It would appear from this array of evidence that children apparently provide the "field of practice" for parents for almost all of the values in this study. It is noteworthy that Patience stands out as one of the values that is not stronger for adults with children than those with no children. Part of the reason for this is that Patience, as defined in this study, has to do with restraint in the face of oppression or situations in which others do things that are undeserved or unfair. While children do create circumstances that are frustrating at times, the fact that they are children is significant in that parents are not likely to take their antics as direct attacks on themselves. They do not perceive these actions in the same way as they would another adult, and therefore, these parents did not respond to the items in the Patience Subscale any different from any other adult. In reference to the Love Subscale, the issues inherent in the items pertain to concern for the well being of others, and acceptance of others, regardless of how different they might be. Here again, the issues are not specific to raising children but pertain more to the "outside" world and therefore, parents are likely to respond to these items much like any other adult would whether they have children or not.

Income Level Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between subjects in five different income levels. These groupings were defined by the following gross annual income levels: (1) $0 - $19,999, (2) $20,000 - $39,999, (3) $40,000 - $59,999, (4) $60,000 - $79,999, and (5) $80,000+. There were no statistically significant differences between mean scores for the Faithfulness, Gentleness, Self-Control, Love, Patience or Kindness Subscales. Nor were there any significant differences between groups on the overall Total Scale. Differences as the $p = .05$ level of significance were found on the remaining subscales. While significant differences were found within the whole income range, for the Goodness Subscale, no two groups were found to be significantly different. People within the $40,000 - $59,999 range scored significantly higher on the Joy

Subscale than those with incomes below $20,000. Similarly, those people within the $60,000 - $79,999 range had mean scores on the Peace Subscale that were significantly higher than those with incomes in the $20,000 - $39,999 range. Tables 49 through 51 show the details of these differences. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

The mean scores between groups on the Goodness Subscale, clearly increase with increasing income and the probability level indicates that there are significant differences within the whole range but the Scheffe Multiple Comparisons Test may be too conservative to identify differences between groups in this case.

The differences in mean score on the Joy and Peace Subscales between people with less than $20,000 and those with higher incomes may well simply reflect the difficulties and personal struggle that is accompanied with low incomes in our culture.

Occupational Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between subjects in the ten different occupational groups in this study. These ten groups are organized under the following categories: (0) Other; (1) Professional, Doctor, Lawyer, Executive; (2) Other Professional, Manager, Teacher, Nurse; (3) Skilled and Building Trades, Farmer; (4) Sales, Technician, Clerical; (5) Laborer, Factory worker, Waitress; (6) General Service Employee; (7) Homemaker; (8) Student; (9) Unemployed.

There were no statistically significant differences between mean scores for the Faithfulness, Gentleness, Joy, Patience or Kindness Subscales. Differences as the *p* = .05 level of significance were found on the Goodness, Self-Control and Love Subscales, and also on the overall Total Scale. Although there were statistically significant differences found within the whole range of occupations for the Self-Control and Love Subscales, as well as the Total Scale, differences between any two specific groups were not found, which may be due to a conservative nature of the Scheffe Multiple Comparisons Test. Significantly different mean scores were found, however, between the Professional group (1), who scored higher, and the Sales, Technical and Clerical group (4) on the Goodness Subscale. Tables 52 through 56 provide the details of those differences. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

In terms of the significant differences between the Professional group and the Sales, Technical and Clerical group on the Goodness Subscale, it is likely that the differences are not specifically related to the kinds of work these people do as much as it may related to educational differences and perhaps age differences which were both significantly related to higher mean scores on this Subscale.

Church Denominational Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between subjects in the nine different church denominations in this study. The denominations in the sample included: (1) Anglican, (2) Baptist, 3) Catholic, (4) Christian & Missionary Alliance, (5) Christian Reformed, (6) Evangelical Free, (7), Lutheran, (8) Pentecostal, and (9) United. There were no statistically significant differences between mean scores for the Faithfulness, Gentleness, Self-Control, Joy, Peace, Patience or Kindness Subscales. Nor were there any significant differences between groups on the overall Total Scale. Differences at the $p = .05$ level of significance were found on the Goodness and Love Subscales. Subjects in the Anglican, Christian Reformed, and United churches scored significantly higher than those in the Christian & Missionary Alliance churches on the Goodness Subscale. On the Love Subscale, the Anglicans scored significantly higher than the Evangelical Free, Christian & Missionary Alliance, and Pentecostals, and the United subjects also scored significantly higher than those in the Evangelical Free denomination. Tables 57 and 58 present the details of these differences. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

In reviewing the differences between denominations it is important to recognize that there were no significant differences on seven of the nine Christian values. Only on the Subscales of Goodness and Love were differences to be found, and these differences appear to be between the two extreme ends of the conservative - liberal spectrum. The items in the Goodness Subscale reflect an involvement in the community at large. It is likely that the differences between the groups on this measure reflect the degree to which their focus and energy is directed to the community around them. The items in the Love Subscale reflect a broad scope of acceptance of all people and a concern for their well being in a broad context. The differences found again appear to occur between the extreme ends of the conservative - liberal continuum. It is likely that it may also reflect the theological emphasis of these groups in that the issue of personal salvation is of high priority to the conservative evangelical groups whereas social condition is of greater emphasis in the liberal mainline groups. Where the question of the status of a person's christian stand is emphasized so strongly, and consequently the implication of one's acceptability or unacceptability, the practice of exclusive thinking is usually close at hand. Perhaps it is not so different from the findings of Milton Rokeach (1960) in his research on racial discrimination where he concluded that it was not so much based on differences in the color of skin as much as in the idea of differing beliefs. These people don't believe like me, therefore, they are different. The mainline church does not place so much emphasis on whether a person is "saved" or not, or a "Christian" or not and consequently, they appear, at least on this measurement, to be more accepting of people with diverse backgrounds, and to relate to them from the broader base of the whole social person.

Church Attendance Differences

One Way Analysis Of Variance was performed on the mean score differences between subjects in five groups, differing in frequency of church attendance. These groups were defined on the basis of the number of church functions attended in an average month as follows: (1) 1 or less, (2) 2 - 3, (3) 4 - 6, (4) 7 - 8, and (5) 9 or more. There were no statistically significant differences between the groups on the Goodness, Faithfulness, Self-Control, or Love Subscales. Differences between the five groups, at the $p = .05$ level of significance were found for the Gentleness, Joy, Peace, Patience and Kindness Subscales, and also for the overall Total Scale. While significant differences were found within the whole range of church attendance for the Gentleness, Patience, Kindness Subscales, no two groups were found to be significantly different. Those who attended church more than twice per week scored significantly higher than those attending church twice per week or less on the Joy and Peace Subscales, and also on the overall Total Scale. Tables 59 through 64 provide the details of those differences. The tests for non-homogeneity of variance were non-significant.

These data clearly show a significant relationship between the christian values of Gentleness, Joy, Peace, Patience, Kindness, and the overall Total score on this Scale with frequency of church attendance. Furthermore, at least, based on the significant differences on the Joy, Peace, and Total mean scores, the frequency level that seems to make a difference was for those that attend church more than twice per week. These findings are similar to Allport and Ross (1967) who found that those who scored higher on their Intrinsic religious motivation scale also tended to attended church twice a week or more. It is noteworthy, however, to notice that frequency of church attendance showed no significant differences for the Goodness or Love Subscales which may be interpreted to imply that while people who attend church frequently experience greater sense of Joy and Peace, and may be more Gentle, Patient, and Kind; it is likely limited to the social circles in which they circulate and does not necessarily reflect its expression out in the general community.

Summary

In reviewing the results of this research project, it is apparent that the foundational aspect of this scale lies in the content basis for item selection. The strengths of the content basis of item selection are derived from the biblical content of the subscale definitions and the development of approximately 900 items which were written, edited and selected to represent the content domain of the construct and minimize test score variance due to item endorsement bias.

The first empirical procedure to be applied to item selection was the use the an expert panel of ordained pastors to judge the degree of congruence between the items and the subscale constructs which resulted in the elimination of the forty five items (twenty percent) with the lowest levels of agreement with their intended subscale. This procedure served to increase the degree of confidence that can be placed in the remaining items that they adequately reflect the biblical definitions or constructs of the nine christian values under consideration in this project.

The sample utilized in this project consisted of 686 adult subjects from nine different christian backgrounds representing a full range of the conservative-liberal continuum from both catholic and protestant contexts. The sample distribution in terms of age, sex, education, marital and family status, occupational categories, income levels, and frequency of church attendance was broadly based which further adds to the confidence that can be placed in the findings of this study. In addition, the participation rate of 73.5 percent for the 50 churches who agreed to participate out the 68 churches originally contacted, and the overall return rate of 72.9 percent of the 956 questionnaires distributed also contributes to the confidence that can be placed in the degree to which this sample represents typical church attenders in the greater Edmonton area.

The second empirical based procedure utilized in item selection was the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the individual items and the subscales. This procedure proved to work well in facilitating the selection of the final items in this scale, and highlighting the relatedness of the specific items with the subscale constructs. As a result, 30 items, or 16.7 percent of the tested items were eliminated.

The internal consistencies of the subscales were found to be satisfactory with Alpha levels ranging from .87 to .76 for eight of the nine subscales. The Love subscale was .68 which was minimumly acceptable, given the diversity of the items and the construct of that subscale. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between subscales fell within a range of .20 between Goodness and Patience, and a high of .71 between Joy and Peace. Although there is a high degree of relatedness between Joy and Peace, evidence did not suggest a mutual dependence between the two subscales, but rather a directional bias in which scores on Joy appeared to be more dependent on the scores on Peace than the reverse. Principal Components Factor Analysis yielded eight separate factors out of the nine subscales. Not surprisingly, items from the Joy and Peace subscales loaded on one factor. These finding further support the confidence that can be placed in the validity and reliability of this scale.

Two external instruments were utilized in this study. The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale was administered to all subjects in the study. It had previously been demonstrated to measure "christian commitment". It yielded a surprising low Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient of .29 with the Christian Lifestyle Inventory. However, a clear differential denominational bias was noted with Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients ranging from .27 to .49 which raises some interesting questions about the relationship between "christian commitment" and living out these nine christian values in the daily world of relationships. The second external instrument, *Insight* is a broad based value inventory that was administered to every fifth subject, or 20 percent of the subjects in this study. The overall Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient with the Christian Lifestyle Inventory was found to be .20. This too, was a surprise and seems to reflect differences in the actual values measured and/or perhaps differences in the range of values covered in the items of the two instruments.

A comparison of the differences between groups in this sample demonstrated the sensitivity of the scale to identify significant differences between them. For example, the results clearly demonstrated significant differences in scores with respect to age in that those people above 50 years of age scored significantly higher than those in the young adult age range which reflects the influence of maturity identified by this scale. Women scored significantly higher on the Faithfulness, Gentleness, Love and Kindness subscales, whereas men scored significantly higher on the Peace subscale. People with 16 years of education scored significantly higher than those with twelve years or less on the Goodness, Faithfulness, and Love subscales and on the overall Total scale score. With respect to marital status, several significant differences between groups were found that are too detailed to report here, however, the married, widowed, and separated subjects scored significantly higher than the single subjects on overall Total scale score. In terms of family status differences, people with children scored significantly higher on all subscales expect Love and Patience. Differences between income level groups were evident for only the Joy and Peace subscales in which higher level income groups scored significantly higher than lower income level groups. With respect to Occupational groups, significant differences between groups were only found for the Goodness subscale in which the Professional group scored higher than the Sales, Technical and Clerical group. There were no significant differences found between the nine different church groups on seven of the subscales, however, significant differences did occur on the Goodness and Love subscales wherein subjects from the liberal mainline church groups scored higher than those from the conservative churches. Finally, those who attend church more than twice per week scored significantly higher than those who attend church twice per week or less on the Joy and Peace subscales and also on the overall Total scale.

This chapter has provided a detailed analysis of the results of this study and discussion of some of the more salient findings. The following chapter will highlight the conclusions to be drawn from this study, some of the implications emanating from the research, and recommendations for future investigation.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research project was to develop a scale that would measure the extent to which the nine christian values of Love, Joy, Peace, Patience, Kindness, Goodness, Faithfulness, Gentleness, and Self-Control influence the lifestyles of people at any given time in their adult life. The methodology for this project followed standard test construction procedures adapted from Jackson (1970,1971) and was consistent with the construct validation framework described by Cronbach (1984), Loevenger (1967), and Messick (1987).

Conclusions

Conclusion One

The first conclusion to be drawn from the results of this study is that the Christian Lifestyle Inventory is a sufficiently valid and reliable instrument that measures the extent to which the christian values of Love, Joy, Peace, Patience, Kindness, Goodness, Faithfulness, Gentleness, and Self-Control influence the lifestyles of people at any given time in their adult life. This conclusion is made within the "self-report" limitation of this study. Clearly, the Christian Lifestyle Inventory only measures what people report about their lifestyle. It does not directly measure the actual lived performance of their lifestyle.

In keeping with Messick's definition of validity as "an integrated evaluative judgement of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of inferences and actions based on test scores" (1987, p.1), the following converging evidence is submitted in support of the above conclusion.

Substantive Component

The first evidence falls within the Substantive Component of Construct validation and includes evidence from the content and empirical bases of item selection. From the point of view of the content basis, the first indicator was the development of a construct for each of the nine christian values in the Christian Lifestyle Inventory from a detailed exegetical analysis of scripture.

The second source of evidence of validity in the Substantive Component was the development of items for inclusion in the scale from an original pool of approximately 900 items in the preliminary scale (Stensland, 1985). The items were designed to represent a range of the content domain specified by each definition. The thirty most representative items from each pool were selected and edited for inclusion in that preliminary scale on the basis of (a) representativeness of a range of the content domain of the value defined, (b) content saturation both with respect to substantive convergence of the value under consideration, and conceptual distinctiveness from each of the other irrelevant values in the whole scale, and (c) sources of response style variance including sex bias, age bias, item length, and item endorsement.

The third source of evidence of validity is related to the preliminary testing of the items in the early study on a sample of 96 subjects from a single church congregation (Stensland, 1985), resulting in the elimination of thirty percent of the items yielding the poorest convergent and divergent correlations with the subscales. Finally, the remaining items were edited further and new items were written to yield 25 items per subscale.

Within the empirical basis for item selection several sources of evidence of validity were pursued. The first was an Item-Objective Congruence Procedure, using a panel of 12 ordained pastors as expert judges, resulting in the elimination of 45 items which represented twenty percent of the items with the lowest agreement with the key. The second was the testing of the items on a sample of 686 adult subjects from 50 churches representing nine different denominational backgrounds spanning the conservative - liberal continuum, both protestant and catholic. The third source of evidence of validity in the empirical item selection context was the item analysis which was used to eliminate those items with the poorest convergent and divergent correlations with the subscales. A fourth source of evidence of validity was the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients of the subscales which documented that the relatedness of the subscales was consistent with the construct. The final evidence for construct validity within the Substantive Component resulted from the exploratory Principal Components Factor Analysis that documented the presence of eight underlying factors and a satisfactory degree of independence of subscales.

Structural Component

Within the Structural Component of Construct Validation the first source of evidence of validity was the Alpha levels of internal consistency for each subscale which indicated moderate to excellent reliability of the subscales. The second source was the mean score and standard deviations for each subscale and the total scale which indicated a satisfactory distribution of scores and discrimination between subjects.

External Component

Within the External Component of Construct Validity, the primary source of evidence for sufficient validity was found in the comparison of the scale with the

Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale which demonstrated the capacity of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory to transcend denominational differences of doctrinal emphasis and terminology to measure actual lifestyle differences pertinent to the values under consideration.

Conclusion Two

The second conclusion to be drawn from the results of this study was that the Desirability subscale did not demonstrate adequate validity or reliability.

The above conclusion is based on three sources of information. The first observation was that the Desirability subscale did not identify any subjects out of the whole sample that were presenting unrealistically favorable pictures of themselves. Secondly, the items in the Desirability subscale did not show up on the Factor Analysis and yielded very low communality values. Thirdly, the Alpha value for the Desirability subscale was .28 which clearly indicated the internal consistency of the scale was unreliable.

Conclusion Three

The third conclusion to be drawn from the results of this study was an unexpected one. That is that the commitment to christian doctrine and terminology is not strongly related to living a christian lifestyle in the world of daily relationships.

The above conclusion is based on the observation of the relatively weak correlation coefficient of .29 between the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale and the Christian Lifestyle Inventory. Secondly, it is based on the observation that the correlation coefficient between the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale and the Christian Lifestyle Inventory showed a differential denominational factor in that those denominations which emphasize the terminology and concepts embodied in the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale items correlated higher than those denominations that don't emphasize such concepts or terminology. Thirdly, there were statistically significant differences on the mean scores on the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale between the conservative and mainline denominations that complemented the denominational correlational coefficient data above. The fourth evidence in support of this conclusion was found in the fact that there were no statistically significant differences between the denominations on seven out of the nine subscales. Significant differences occurred on the Love and Goodness subscales which reflect a broad based acceptance of all people and involvement in the community at large, on which the mainline denominations scored higher.

Conclusion Four

The fourth conclusion to be drawn from these data is that the relatedness of the Christian Lifestyle Inventory to *Insight* was minimal.

The basis for the above conclusion rests on the observation that the overall correlation coefficient between the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and *Insight* was .20 with a range among the subscales from -.04 on Patience to .32 on Goodness.

Implications

It is clear from the foregoing information that the Christian Lifestyle Inventory has been demonstrated to be a sufficiently valid and reliable instrument to measure the extent to which these nine christian values are reported to be evident in the lifestyles of people. There is, however, a potential danger of abuse in the application of this inventory for those persons who are inclined to misinterpret or over-interpret the results to measure spirituality or the idea of how "good" a Christian someone might be. Moberg (1984) expressed this writer's concern very well when he stated: "Inevitably the use of any index or scale to measure any subject represents an abstraction from reality" (p. 359).

It is important, from this writer's perspective, that a distinction be made between spirituality or religiousness and lifestyle. Perhaps the analogy of the wind is useful to illustrate this distinction. The wind is a powerful force but it cannot be seen. What is observed is the effects of the wind. A similar analogy can be made with an hydraulic press. The force cannot be seen but its effects can be observed and measured. So it is with lifestyle. The lifestyle values measured in this scale are lifestyle measures, not spirituality measures, though a spiritual dimension is reflected indirectly. Perhaps a more useful model would be the idea of horizontal and vertical axes. These lifestyle values are measured in the context of the horizontal axis which relates to one's relationship with others. The vertical axis refers to one's relationship with the Divine and clearly is not the direct object of measurement in this inventory.

One of the implications of this study emerges from this vertical-horizontal distinction as it relates to the third conclusion above. How does one understand the denominational differences between the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale? It seems evident that the differential denominational factor was related to the familiarity of the particular church group with the terminology and concepts embodied in the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale items.

Perhaps a digression into conceptualization is useful at this point. The expressions of these nine christian values are lived out on the horizontal axis but by definition are sourced in the vertical axis. How can these differential expressions reflect a single vertical source? This writer proposes that the vertical source is not a single source but rather it is a vertical source with two elements, one being a deeply individualized relationship with the Divine and the second an institutional/cultural element perpetuated by the corporate church or community within which one associates. The first is consistent with Brian Hall's (1986) concept of an inner reality that lies behind each of the values. He described it as "an image, often unconscious, of what that value represents" (p. 22). It is a vague awareness perhaps a gentle urging that is without specific form or structure. It sounds similar to Carl Jung's description of the movement from the unconscious to conscious awareness: "My life is a story of the self-realization of the unconscious. Everything in the unconscious seeks outward manifestation, and the personality too desires to evolve out of its unconscious conditions and to experience itself as a whole" (1963, p. 3). These inner beginnings were also described by St. Thomas Aquinas as "instinctive propensities" that pre-exist and are brought to completion by appropriate activity (1960, p. 378). While these are the beginnings, they are without form and structure. It is proposed here, that the form and structure comes though the second element in the vertical axis by way of the church or other institutional/cultural community. It is in this context that the differences in form and structure evolve. A ready example of the variety of forms and structures that exist can be experienced simply by visiting a number of worship services in churches from different christian backgrounds. Butman (1990) described it well when he stated: ". . . each particular religious subculture has an almost all to predictable tendency to create its own distinctively religious language, which can feel like *sociological passwords* to the uninitiated" (p. 17).

It seems evident that it is crucial to be cognizant of this horizontal axis expression and the vertical axis source in the development of religiosity instruments. Secondly, it is important to distinguish, as much as possible, between the individualized element in the vertical axis and the institutional/cultural community element with its specific forms and structures which inadvertently bias test results. It is for that reason that the Christian Lifestyle Inventory items are devoid of religious sounding terminology, though every effort was made to insure that they reflect the biblical based definitions. The results suggest that the scale did succeed in at least reducing if not minimizing this potential institutional/cultural community source of error variance in the instrument.

In reviewing the value theories included in the review of literature in chapter two, it is apparent that all of them accommodated the concepts of choosing, prizing and acting on those choices with some evidence of consistency. However, this element of the inner, individual reality and its expression in an outer reality is best described in Brian Hall's (1986) *Genesis Effect* theory and seems particularly appropriate to accommodate this horizontal versus vertical axis concept.

In reviewing the religiosity scales included in the review of literature in chapter two it is apparent that all of them included aspects of both the vertical and horizontal axes. However, the Spiritual Well-Being Scales by Ellison and Paloutzian (cited in Bassett, et al., in press) and by Moberg (1984) seemed to distinguish between the horizontal and vertical axes most clearly.

From this writer's perspective, it seems difficult, if not impossible to attempt to measure activities related to the vertical axis without encountering the form and structural biases of specific institutional/cultural communities. The Christian Lifestyle Inventory may have an advantage in actually avoiding or transcending such biases by measuring only the horizontal axis and avoiding "religious sounding" terminology and concepts in the items themselves.

Another implication of this study can be seen in the increasing awareness that spiritual development does not occur in a vacuum but is an integrated function of an individuals overall psycho/social/spiritual development. The degree to which humans reflect any measure of health or holiness in the spiritual or any other dimension of their lives is related to the *raw material*, developmentally or historically that they bring into their christian faithing commitment (Butman, 1990). Butman stated it succinctly, when he wrote, "Clearly, religion can be evidenced in both healthy and unhealthy forms", (p. 17). Accordingly, Butman stated that, "Religious development will always reflect the dynamic interplay between our psychological and spiritual dimensions. Ideally, that integrated nature will reflect a high degree of psychospiritual unity" (p. 16). It is in this context that Butman commented that, "Although core dimensions of personhood may not be scalable (e.g., *heart, self,* or *spirit*), their *fruit*, expressed in terms of more directly observable behaviors, must be, or these concerns will have limited usefulness to the academician, clinician, or researcher" (p. 17). Similarly, Richard Foster (1988) suggested that the cultivation of the full christian character, meaning a person who cultivates and expresses the *Fruit of the Spirit*, perhaps reflects the ultimate in spiritual and psychological well-being from a christian perspective. In another context, Boivin, Donkin & Darling (1990) confirmed earlier findings that measures of religiosity, christian commitment and church attendance correspond well to one another, but are poor predictors of other indicators of social and psychological well-being and as such their construct validity is tenuous. They concluded that "an empirical validation of *sanctification* and *self-actualization* will not be achieved until measures of spiritual well-being include behavioral observations of individuals demonstrating the *fruits of the Spirit* in real-life situations" (p. 41). Finally, in a more specific application, Larson (1989) highlighted the usefulness of assessing the impact of religious faith in marriage and family relationships and suggested that the *fruit of the Spirit* may have potential in assessing marital outcome variables. The implication in these observations is that there seems to be an increasing interest in the potential of a scale such as the Christian Lifestyle Inventory which is based on the Fruit of the Spirit to be useful in a variety of religiosity applications. It seems to be a scale that lies close to the leading edge of at least some researchers who are working to examine the role religion plays in the economy of people's lives.

Recommendations

There are three areas to which recommendations are directed as a result of this research project. The first area includes recommendations designed to strengthen the scale itself, the second area pertains to further validation studies, and the third area deals with concerns outside the immediate purview of this scale.

Recommendations To Improve The Scale

The first recommendation in this category is that further work be carried out to develop and test additional items in the Love Subscale in order to improve its internal consistency.

Secondly, it is recommended that further work be done to develop and test additional items in the Joy and Peace Subscales in order to increase the independence of the two scales.

Thirdly, it is recommended that additional work should be done to document the test re-test reliability of the scale.

Finally, it is recommended that further work be done to explore the development of a Desirability Subscale that is not only sufficiently valid and reliable but also remains distinctly different from the content subscales. This latter recommendation may prove to be too difficult to carry out because of the nature of the content of these scales. This has been a common problem among the many religiosity scales so far (Butman, 1990, Moberg, 1984, Van Wicklin, 1990).

Recommendations For Further Validation

In view of the "self-report" limitation of this inventory, further validation studies are recommended to explore concurrent validity by (a) comparing objective behavioral ratings of individuals by others with their scores on this scale and, (b) comparing performance on this scale with that of other suitable external measures.

In addition, further validation studies are recommended to compare the performance of this scale on a sample of non-church people and other contrasting groups.

Finally, a number of potential uses of this scale were identified in the introductory chapter of this thesis. It is acknowledged that validation studies should be carried out in each of those areas in order to document the construct validity of this scale in those applications.

Other Recommendations

It is recommended that further work be done to explore the issue of commitment to christian doctrine and practice and its relatedness to christian lifestyle. This recommendation will be recognized as one resulting from the differential denominational results on the Intrinsic

Religious Motivational Scale and refers particularly to the institutional/cultural biases of specific groups that serve to penalize or bias the outcomes of people who are not familiar with the terminology and practices of that particular group. This problem is not a new one as St. Thomas Aquinas noted in *Summa Theologica, Ia-2ae. i.7* where he stated: "Deliciousness is delightful to every taste, but some find it best in wine, others in candy, and so forth", (Aquinas, 1960, p. 265). It is important, in test development of this nature, that the researcher is able to specify whether the test items are measuring different preferences of deliciousness or different preferences of wine or candy. The Christian Lifestyle Inventory makes a significant contribution to this goal.

References

Allen, R. O. & Spilka, B. (1967). Committed and consensual religion: A specification of religion-prejudice relationships. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 6, 191-206.

Allport, G. W. (1950). The individual and his religion. New York: Macmillan.

Allport, G. W. & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 432-443.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). Manual for study of values (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Aquinas, St. Thomas. (1960). In T. Gilby (Ed. and Trans.), St. thomas aquinas: Philosophical texts. New York: Oxford University Press.

Aristotle. (1963). The nicomachean ethics. In J. Warrington (Ed. and Trans.), Artistotle's ethics. London: Everyman's Library, J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

Avis, W. S., Drysdale, P. D., Gregg, R. J., & Scargill, M. H. (Eds.). (1973). Dictionary of canadian english: The senior dictionary. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing Limited.

Bassett, R. L., Camplin, W., Humphrey, D., Dorr, C., Biggs, S., Distaffen, R., Doxtator, I., Flaherty, M., Hunsberger, P. J., Poage, R., & Thompson, H. (in press). Measuring christian maturity: A comparison of several surveys. Journal of Psychology and Theology.

Bassett, R. L., Sadler, R. D., Kobischen, E. E., Skiff, D. M., Merrill, I. J., Atwater, B. J., & Livermore, P. W. (1981). The shepherd scale: Separating the sheep from the goats. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 9, 335-351.

Batson, C. D., & Ventis, W. L. (1982). The religious experience: A social-psychological perspective. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bibby, R. W. (1987). Fragmented gods: The poverty and potential of religion in canada. Toronto: Irwin Publishing.

Blackman, E. C. (1950). In A. Richardson (Ed.), A theological word book of the bible. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Boivin, M. J., Donkin, A.J. & Darling, H. W. (1990). Religiosity and prejudice: A case study in evaluating the construct validity of christian measures. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 9, 41-55.

Butman, R. E. (1990). The assessment of Religious development: Some possible options. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 9, 14-26.

Buttrick, G. A. (Ed.). (1962). The interpreter's dictionary of the bible: An illustrated encyclopedia (vols. 1-4). New York: Abington Press.

Cole, A. (1974). The epistle of paul to the galatians. In R. V. G. Tasker (Ed.), The tyndale new testament commentaries. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Cranfield, C. E. B. (1950). In A. Richardson (Ed.), A theological word book of the bible. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Cronbach, L. J. (1984). Essentials of psychological testing (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Dyer, J. (1984, October). Nine evidences of the fruit of the spirit. A lecture series presented at the Spruce Grove Alliance Church, Spruce Grove, AB.

Ellison, C. W. (1987, October). Spirituality: Theory, research, and application. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Region of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, Lancaster, PA.

Ellison, C. W. (1983). Spiritual well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11, 330-340.

Erikson, E. H. (1950). Childhood and society. New York: W. W. Norton.

Evans, C. F. (1950). In A. Richardson (Ed.), A theological word book of the bible. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Foster, R. J. (1988). Celebration of discipline: The path to spiritual growth (rev. ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Fowler, J. W. (1981). Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1984). Statistical methods in education and psychology (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hague, W. J. (1986). New perspectives on religious and moral development. Edmonton: Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta.

Hall, B. P. (in press). Human and organizational transformation through values. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Hall, B. P. (1990). Insight: Steps of value development. Santa Cruz, CA: Brian P. Hall, Publisher.

Hall, B. P. (1986). The genesis effect: Personal and Organizational Transformations. New York: Paulist Press.

Hall, B. P., & Tonna, B. (1985). The hall-tonna inventory of values. Omega Associates, Inc.

Hambleton, R. K. (1984). Validating the test scores. In R. A. Beck (Ed.), A guide to criterion-referenced test construction (pp. 207-225). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hoge, D. R. (1972). A validated intrinsic religious motivation scale. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11, 369-376.

Jackson, D. N. (1965). Personality Research Form: Questionnaire Form AA. Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press, Inc.

Jackson, D. N. (1970). A sequential system for personality scale development. In C. D. Spielberger (Ed.), Current topics in clinical and community psychology (vol. 2) (pp. 61-96). New York: Academic Press.

Jackson, D. N. (1971). The dynamics of structured personality tests. Psychological review, 78, 229-248.

Jackson, D. N. (1984). Personality research form manual (3rd ed.). Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press, Inc.

James, W. (1902). The varieties of religious experience. New York: The Modern Library.

Jung, C. G. (1963). Memories, dreams, reflections. New York: Vintage Books.

Kluckhohn, C. A. (1951). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.), Toward a general theory of action (pp. 388-433). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Kohlberg, L. (1980). Stages of moral development as a basis for moral education. In B. Munsey (Ed.), Moral development, moral education, and Kohlberg: Basic issues in philosophy, psychology, religion, and education (pp. 15-98). Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Larson, L. E. (1989). Religiosity and marital commitment: 'Until death do us part' revisited. Family Science Review 2, 1-17.

Lewis, C. S. (1960). The four loves. Glasgow: Collins-Fount Paperbacks.

Lewis, C. S. (1965). The weight of glory. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Lloyd-Jones, D. M. (1977). Studies in the sermon on the mount. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.

Loevinger, J. (1967). Objective tests as instruments of psychological theory. In D. N. Jackson & S. Messick (Eds.), Problems in human assessment (pp. 78-123). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Maloney, V. E. (1986, October). The life style inventory: Measuring the fruit of the spirit. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Region of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, Speculator, NY.

Malony, H. N. (1988). The clinical assessment of optimal religious functioning. Review of Religious Research, 30. 3-17.

Maslow, A. H. (1968), Toward a psychology of being (2nd ed.). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Messick, S. (1987). Research report: Validity. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Moberg, D. O. (Ed.). (1979). Spiritual well-being: Sociological Perspectives. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Moberg, D. O. (1984). Subjective measures of spiritual well-being. Review of Religious Research, 25(4), 351-364.

Parsons, T. & Shils, E. A. (1951). Categories of the orientation and organization of action. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.), Toward a general theory of action (pp. 388-433). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Peck, M. S., von Waldner, M., & Kay, P. (1985). Dimensions of the christian experience: What return can I make? New York: Simon & Schuster.

Pecnik, J. A., & Epperson, D. L. (1985). A factor analysis and further validation of the shepherd scale. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 13, 42-49.

Raths, L. E., Harmin, M., & Simon, S. B. (1978). Values and teaching: Working with values in the classroom (2nd ed.). Toronto: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Richardson, A. (1950). A theological word book of the bible. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind: investigations into the nature of belief systems and personality systems. New York: Basic Books.

Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M. (1969). Values systems in religion. Review of Religious Research 11(1), 3-39.

Rokeach, M. (1970). Religious values and social compassion. Review of Religious Research, 11(2), 136-162.

Schneiders, S. M. (1986). Women and the world. New York: Paulist Press.

Silverman, W. (1983). Bibliography of measurement techniques used in the social scientific study of religion. Psychological Documents, 13, 1. (Ms. no 2539)

Smith, R. G. (1950). In A. Richardson (Ed.), A theological word book of the bible. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Spilka, B., Hood, R. W. Jr., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1985). The psychology of religion: An empirical approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

SSPS (1988). SSPS-X: User's guide (3rd ed.). Chicago: SSPS Inc.

Stamm, R. T. (1953). The epistle to the galatians. In N. B. Harmon (Ed.), The interpreter's bible. Vol. X. (pp. 427-593). New York: Abington-Cokesbury Press.

Stensland, D. W. (1985). Development of a christian lifestyle scale. Unpublished manuscript, University of Alberta, Department of Educational Psychology, Edmonton.

Stott, J. R. W. (1978). The message of the sermon on the mount (Matthew 5-7). Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.

Strunk, O., Jr. (1965). Mature religion: A psychological study. New York: Abington Press.

Townsend, J. S., & Wichern, F. B. (1984). The development of the spiritual qualities inventory. Journal of psychology and Theology, 12, 305-313.

Van Wicklin, J. F. (1990). Conceiving and measuring ways of being religious. Journal of Psychology and Christianity. 9, 27-40.

Vine, W. E. (1952). Vine's expository dictionary of new testament words. Oliphants Ltd.

Whitehouse, W. A. (1950). In A. Richardson (Ed.), A theological word book of the bible. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Wishart, D. (1987, June). Clustan user manual (4th ed.). St. Andrews, Scotland: University of St. Andrews, Computing Laboratory.

APPENDIX A: List Of Initial Items And Results of Item-Objective Congruence Judgements

TABLE A-1 Randomized Initial Items By Category

GOODNESS

56. I take action to oppose what I think is wrong in society. (JC = Goodness, Key = 100.0%)

234. I give money to provide disaster relief to people. (JC = Goodness, Key = 75.0%)

90. I attend candidate forums and always vote in local, regional, and national elections, when possible. (JC = Goodness, Key = 83.3%)

154. I give money to at least three charities annually. (JC = Kindness, Key = 41.7%)

172. When I see someone taking advantage of others, I do something about it. (JC = Goodness, Key = 91.7%)

64. I am not one to express my concerns on moral issues.(R) (JC = Goodness, Key = 75.0%)

209. I bring errors to the attention of the cashier in stores where they under-charge me. (JC = Goodness, Key = 50.0%)

8. I take individual action to assist the police in stopping crime. (JC = Goodness, Key = 83.3%)

109. I do volunteer work in my community. (JC = Goodness, Key = 58.3%)

84. I sometimes "cheat" or "bend the rules" in order to get ahead.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 41.7%)

184. I take from this world more than I contribute to it.(R) (JC = Goodness, Key = 58.3%)

100. I am known as a fair person. (JC = Goodness, Key = 66.7%)

235. I spend time helping less fortunate groups of people. (JC = Goodness, Key = 66.7%)

122. I take action to preserve the environment. (JC = Goodness, Key = 100.0%)

215. I do not knowingly do things that harm the earth's environment. (JC = Goodness, Key = 91.7%)

160. I think the little bit I might do to help preserve the environment is so minor that it just isn't worth my effort.(R) (JC = Goodness, Key = 75.0%)

135. There are times when I just have to stand up for what is right in this world. (JC = Goodness, Key = 100.0%)

85. I don't waste my time trying to influence government decisions.(R) (JC = Goodness, Key = 66.7%)

231. I am willing to risk arrest to make my community and country a better place to live. (JC = Goodness, Key = 100.0%)

196. I prefer to deal with my own affairs than get involved in community projects.(R) (JC = Goodness, Key = 83.3%)

17. *I tell lies to avoid trouble. (R) (JC = Peace, Key = 33.3%)

159. *I give more than fifteen percent of my gross personal income to the church or other religious organizations. (JC = Other, Key = 33.3%)

134. *I do not knowingly exceed the speed limit, except in emergencies. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 25.0)

202. *I share what I have with people less fortunate than myself. (JC = Kindness, Key = 8.3%)

191. *If I found a wallet with $20 and the owner's identification in it, I would probably not return it.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 41.7%)

FAITHFULNESS

60. People confide in me often. (JC = Other, Key = 25.0%)

210. I am firm in my beliefs and live them consistently. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 25.0%)

114. When I tell someone I'll do something for them, they can count on it. (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 100.0%)

19. I break promises more often than I should.(R) (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 75.0%)

177. People seem to trust me a lot. (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 66.7%)

195. I am a dependable person. (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 91.7%)

152. I am good at following through with my commitments. (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 75.0%)

76. I wish people wouldn't depend on me so much.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 50.0%)

92. I make an effort to carry my share of the workload. (JC = Other, Key = 33.3%)

212. I don't go back on my word. (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 100.0%)

201. I am often asked to take responsibility for things. (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 100.0%)

36. I am known as a person who gets things done. (JC = Other, Key = 41.7%)

142. Dependability is not one of my strengths.(R) (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 75.0%)

137. I practice what I preach. (JC = Other, Key = 41.7%)

229. People seem to have a lot of confidence in me. (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 58.3%)

112. I believe that God or a higher power takes a personal interest in me. (JC = Peace, Key = 25.0%)

37. My personal integrity and honesty is not as consistent as my friends think it is.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 25.0%)

138. I often just wish people would find someone else to depend on.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 41.7%)

88. I am a very loyal person. (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 100.0%)

63. People seem reluctant to trust me with important things.(R) (JC = Faithfulness, Key = 75.0%)

111. *I do things I shouldn't when I am not around people who know me. (R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 8.3%)

87. *I believe that God or a higher power influences my life. (JC = Peace, Key = 16.7%)

12. *I seem to bounce from one thing to another in my life. (R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 8.3%)

106. **There is something quite solid and stable about my life. (JC = Peace, Key = 16.7%) (moved to Peace = 58.3%)

182. *I have a lot of good intentions that don't seem to work out very well. (R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 8.3%)

GENTLENESS

38. I worry about what my neighbors think of me.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 25.0%)

13. I get upset when my opinions are questioned.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 33.3%)

14. I'm good at keeping my feelings to myself.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 41.7%)

190. I keep my distance with people.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 25.0%)

228. Relationships work well for me. (JC = Love, Key = 41.7%)

165. I am a private person.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 33.3%)

35. ***Intimacy is not one of my gifts.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 83.3%) (Modified to: Intimacy is not one of my well developed gifts.(R))

65. It's really important for me to be right.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 33.3%)

216. I'm good at laughing at my own mistakes. (JC = Joy, Key = 25.0%)

217. My sense of self-worth is low.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 41.7%)

192. I handle criticism very well. (JC = Gentleness, Key = 41.7%)

161. I care a lot about the feelings of others. (JC = Love, Key = 41.7%)

67. I very much want to be more tender and understanding. (JC = Love, Key = 25.0%)

115. I work hard at listening carefully before I speak. (JC = Gentleness, Key = 83.3%)

83. I would not describe myself as a tender person.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 41.7%)

168. Others seem to think I am an inconsiderate person.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 25.0%)

1. *I overlook people's faults. (JC = Love, Key = 0.0%)

6. *I stretch the truth so people will think better of me. (R) (JC = Peace, Key = 16.77%)

140. *I like the way I am. (JC = Peace, Key = 16.7%)

116. *I'm afraid of failure. (R) (JC = Peace, Key = 8.3%)

39. *I am not upset when my friends disagree with my opinions. (JC = Patience, Key = 16.7%)

117. *I actively try to be more sensitive to the needs of others. (JC = Kindness, Key = 16.7%)

218. *I strive to respect where others are coming from. (JC = Love, Key = 0.0%)

32. *I tend to act without thinking. (R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 0.0%)

193. *I often say things I don"t mean. (R) (JC = Other, Key = 8.3%)

SELF-CONTROL

118. There are at least two major areas of my life that I don't seem to get under control very well.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 83.3%)

93. I just can't say no to some temptations.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 91.7%)

68. I tend to get the "bug", and buy things on impulse.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 91.7%)

124. I procrastinate on too many things.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 66.7%)

211. I've worked out a budget and am pretty good at sticking to it. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 100.0%)

52. I use my credit card to buy things I otherwise couldn't afford.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 83.3%)

43. I manage my time very well. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 83.3)

18. I am careful to eat nutritious balanced meals, and avoid snacks between meals. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 75.0%)

194. I make sure I get enough exercise. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 83.3%)

169. I spend more money than I should on entertainment and other things I like to do.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 83.3%)

44. Once I sit down in front of the T.V., I just can't seem to get up and shut it off.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 83.3%)

207. I get side-tracked or distracted from the things I should be doing.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 75.0%)

95. I have a hard time getting rid of bad habits.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 83.3%)

74. I am very successful at making changes in my life. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 66.7%)

171. I'm good at self-discipline. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 91.7%)

146. I am more self-indulgent than I should be.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 91.7%)

121. Sexual temptation is not a struggle for me. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 75.0%)

96. I do things repeatedly that cause me to feel ashamed of myself.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 58.3%)

199. I handle my anger very well. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 66.7%)

46. I can stick to my plans very well. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 50.0%)

80. *I am good at making resolutions, and sticking to them. (JC = Self-Control, Key = 50.0%)

119. *I am not overly influenced by others. (JC = Other, Key = 41.7%)

220. *I lose my temper more than I should.(R) (JC = Self-Control, Key = 50.0%)

120. *I work best under pressure of deadlines.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 33.3%)

101. *I take care of my own needs very well. (JC = Other, Key = 25.0%)

DESIRABILITY

162. I spend a lot of money on other people. (JC = Kindness, Key = 16.7%)

21. When someone presents me with strong arguments, I usually try to settle on some middle ground. (JC = Peace, Key = 0.0%)

31. Most people are honest enough that I would let them work in my home without close supervision. (JC = Love, Key = 25.0%)

72. I am only very rarely in a position where I feel a need to actively argue for a point of view I hold. (JC = Gentleness, Key = 8.3%)

22. If faced by a good argument, I am usually willing to change my position even on important issues. (JC = Peace, Key = 0.0%)

123. Most of the people with whom I am in contact, ignore any minor errors I make. (JC = Other, Key = 58.3%)

173. I don't mind answering questions about my family or friends when applying for a job.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 25.0%)

98. Most of the criticism I receive can be used to my advantage by helping me to improve myself.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 16.7%)

149. I am not very insistent in an argument. (JC = Gentleness, Key = 8.3%)

49. I don't like people to joke about what I feel are my shortcomings.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 50.0%)

LOVE

223. I can't handle being around people who are dying or seriously ill.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 58.3%)

94. I really enjoy listening to other people tell about themselves. (JC = Love, Key = 58.3%)

23. I don't like people who swear a lot.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 50.0%)

10. I think about people suffering in other parts of the world several times a week. (JC = Goodness, Key = 25.0%)

70. I am concerned for the well-being of others, regardless of whether I like them or not. (JC = Love, Key = 66.7%)

24. I admire handicapped people. (JC = Love, Key = 50.0%)

7. I share the pain of those who are struggling. (JC = Love, Key = 66.7%)

53. Most of my prayers are about personal matters.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 33.3%)

5. I think most people on unemployment benefits are lazy.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 50.0%)

97. I think people who are down and out usually ask for it.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 41.7%)

179. I think there ought to be a law against homosexuals.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 41.7%)

145. I think gays and lesbians have a difficult life to live. (JC = Love, Key = 50.0%)

89. I think the majority of people who join protest rallies are just looking for attention.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 25.0%)

156. I feel left behind when good things happen to others.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 41.7%)

164. I steer clear of people who are going through difficult times.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 25.0%)

186. I like celebrating people's accomplishments with them. (JC = Love, Key = 58.3%)

143. I'm secretly pleased when someone else makes a foolish mistake.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 66.7%)

127 I tend to trust people easily. (JC = Love, Key = 33.3%)

213. I have friends whose ethnic background is different from mine. (JC = Love, Key = 75.0%)

205. ***I have some racial prejudice in me.(R) (JC = Love, Key = 58.3%) (Modified to: I have quite a bit of racial prejudice in me.(R))

104. *I seldom get involved with other people's personal problems. (R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 8.3%)

103. *When I say something unkind to someone, I go back and apologize, even if they started it. (JC = Gentleness, Key = 0.0%)

71. *I prefer not to hear about other people who are hurting. (R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 25.0%)

150. *National and international news doesn't interest me much.(R) (JC = Goodness, Key = 16.7%)

69. *I think non-conformists are good for society. (JC = Other, Key = 8.3%)

JOY

42. I tend to see what goes wrong more often than what goes right.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 33.3%)

47. If it weren't for my friends I don't think I could keep going.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 16.7%)

75. I see goodness in more things than most people. (JC = Other, Key = 33.3%)

3. I seem to really enjoy living more than most people. (JC = Joy, Key = 83.3%)

167. My smile is only on the outside, much of the time. (R) (JC = Joy, Key = 58.3%)

15. I rarely go a whole day without being thankful for something. (JC = Joy, Key = 91.7%)

175. I love a celebration. (JC = Joy, Key = 91.7%)

62. I am a happy person inside. (JC = Joy, Key = 100.0%)

110. I am known as a thankful person. (JC = Joy, Key = 75.0%)

224. I need a lot of encouragement from others. (R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 25.0%)

55. Even when the going gets tough, I can keep going. (JC = Other, Key = 16.7%)

48. People like to be around me. (JC = Other, Key 16.7%)

51. People avoid me when they are down.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 33.3%)

204. I am fun to be around. (JC = Joy, Key = 91.7%)

41. I have a well developed sense of humour. (JC = Joy, Key = 75.0%)

26. Thinking about the future makes me uneasy.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 25.0%)

20. I tend to be a negative thinker.(R) (JC = Joy, Key = 91.7%)

79. I cope with minor disappointments and frustrating events very well. (JC = Patience, Key 25.0%)

102. I am moody and not a pleasant person to be around.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 33.3%)

34. I seem to be sad or depressed more than most people I know.(R) (JC = Joy, Key = 91.7%)

185. *I'd just like to run away from it all quite often. (R) (JC = Peace, Key = 8.3%)

225. *I get tired of trying to be such a good person. (R) (JC = Other, Key = 8.3%)

54. *I give up easily.(R) (JC = Other, Key = 0.0%)

188. *People come to me for encouragement. (JC = Kindness, Key = 0.0%)

166. *I tend to panic when traumatic situations happen. (R) (JC = Peace, Key = 8.3%)

PEACE

81. I am fairly tense most of the time.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 58.3%)

9. I worry about a lot of things.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 33.3%)

226. If I were given six months to live I would change my lifestyle dramatically.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 41.7%)

73. I wish my conscience wouldn't bother me so much.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 41.7%)

129. I have trouble making up my mind on personal matters.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 66.7%)

77. There is something significant lacking in my inner life.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 66.7%)

144. It's hard for me to make up my mind.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 58.3%)

27. I am content with my life. (JC = Peace, Key = 50.0%)

174. I like the way I live. (JC = Peace, Key = 58.3%)

91. I'm good at resolving my conflicts with others. (JC = Peace, Key = 58.3%)

133. I'm good at helping others settle their differences. (JC = Peace, Key = 75.0%)

40. People get me upset quite often.(R) (JC = Patience, Key 16.7%)

203. I feel guilty quite often.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 58.3%)

16. I seem to be misunderstood more than most people.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 58.3%)

148. I do forgive myself for making mistakes and using poor judgment. (JC = Peace, Key = 58.3%)

178. I have a clear awareness of my purpose in life. (JC = Peace, Key = 83.3%)

128. I am ashamed of myself more often than not.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 50.0%)

163. I am not sure what I should do with my life.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 75.0%)

181. I wish I were somebody else.(R) (JC = Peace, Key = 50.0%)

78. *I am not resentful. (JC = Patience, Key = 8.3%)

61. *I tend to hold on to grudges.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 8.3%)

197. **I apologize to people I've treated unfairly. (JC = Gentleness, Key = 16.7%) (moved to gentleness = 41.7%)

189. **I seem to upset others quite often.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 25.0%) (moved to gentleness = 58.3%)

200. *Several people owe me an apology.(R) (JC = Gentleness, Key = 8.3%)

105. *I do forgive others for making mistakes and using poor judgement. (JC = Patience, Key = 0.0%)

PATIENCE

139. It's hard for me to be patient.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 83.3%)

28. People who should know better really get on my nerves. (R) (JC = Patience, Key = 50.0%)

198. I just can't hold my tongue when people make foolish and costly mistakes.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 66.7%)

4. I have a lot of tolerance of inconsiderate people. (JC = Patience, Key = 91.7%)

66. I get even with people who treat me unfairly.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 75.0%)

208. I tolerate unfairness very well. (JC = Patience, Key = 58.3%)

183. I don't take "guff" from anyone.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 75.0%)

170. I give people a second chance. (JC = Patience, Key = 66.7%)

45. I tolerate difficult relationships better than most people. (JC = Patience, Key = 83.3%)

219. I choose not to get even with people who take advantage of me. (JC = Patience, Key = 75.0%)

214. It is not difficult for me to forgive mean and unkind people. (JC = Patience, Key = 66.7%)

151. I consider the needs of others before reacting to their hurtful behavior. (JC = Patience, Key = 75.0%)

230. I am forgiving when someone in a position of authority is mean or unfair to me. (JC = Patience, Key = 91.7%)

155. I am not very forgiving when a neighbour is unfair to me.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 58.3%)

30. I am forgiving when a close family member is mean or unfair to me. (JC = Patience, Key = 75.0%)

206. I am forgiving when a close friend is unfair to me. (JC = Patience, Key = 66.7%)

131. I give people the benefit of the doubt when they are late and keep me waiting. (JC = Patience, Key = 83.3%)

113. I just can't resist getting even with some people.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 50.0%)

125. I am easy going, even with difficult people. (JC = Patience, Key = 66.7%)

187. I choose to let nasty or unfair actions pass without retaliating. (JC = Patience, Key = 83.3%)

29. *I will say something nasty under my breath to a careless driver in another car.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 41.7%)

2. *People know better than to cross me.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 50.0%)

130. *I react with anger, inwardly or outwardly, when someone says something unfair about me.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 50.0%)

99. *I tend to give people "a piece of my mind" when they upset me.(R) (JC = Patience, Key = 50.0%)

141. **Most people seem to feel particularly safe and comfortable around me. (JC = Gentleness, Key = 0.0%) (moved to gentleness = 58.3%)

KINDNESS

58. I get upset with people who don't show their appreciation for what I do for them.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 50.0%)

136. I don't go out of my way to find ways to do things for others.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key 75.0%)

126. People ask me to help them quite often. (JC = Kindness, Key 83.3%)

153. I keep in touch with people who need help in some way. (JC = Kindness, Key = 91.7%)

147. I invite people to live in my home if they need a place to stay. (JC = Kindness, Key = 100.0%)

86. It kind of irks me to take time from my busy schedule to help people who don't help themselves.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 75.0%)

132. I choose to give people money when they need it, rather than lend it to them. (JC = Kindness, Key = 83.3%)

107. I spend time with people who are hurting. (JC = Kindness, Key = 50.0%)

57. It bothers me to keep on inviting people to my home, when they never invite me to their home.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 58.3%)

11. I do helpful things for other people almost every day. (JC = Kindness, Key = 66.7%)

59. I do things for people, anonymously. (JC = Kindness, Key = 75.0%)

180. I am known as one who does things for others. (JC = Kindness, Key = 83.3%)

50. I sacrifice for the benefit of others. (JC = Kindness, Key = 58.3%)

25. I am so busy I don't have time to do things for others.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 91.7%)

233. When something needs doing, I am one of the first persons they ask. (JC = Kindness, Key = 58.3%)

158. I spend at least three hours per week doing things for specific people above and beyond my usual responsibilities. (JC = Kindness, Key = 66.7%)

108. I guess I am more of a "taker" than a "giver" with people close to me.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 66.7%)

33. I am less sensitive than most people to the practical needs of others.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 58.3%)

227. Serving others in practical ways is my strongest gift. (JC = kindness, key = 75.0%)

82. I don't mind helping people who cannot return the favor. (JC = Kindness, Key = 83.3%)

176. *It is hard for me to show another person that I care a lot about them.(R) (JC = Love, Key 25.0%)

222. *I enjoy befriending someone others have given up on or avoid. (JC = Kindness, Key = 50.0%)

232. **I don't mind listening to people's troubles. (JC = Gentleness, Key 33.3%) (moved to gentleness = 33.3%)

157. *I resent people for asking me to help them. (R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 50.0%)

221. *I prefer to organize others than do things for people myself.(R) (JC = Kindness, Key = 58.3%)

Note: * item rejected
** item moved to another category
*** item modified
JC: Indicates Judged Category selected by majority of judges.
Key: Percentage of judgements in agreement with keyed category.

TABLE A-2 Results of Item-Objective Congruence Judgements by Pastors to Randomly Presented Items

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
*1	GE	0.0	L	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	5	0	0
*2	PA	50.0	PA	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	1
3	J	83.3	J	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	0
4	PA	91.7	PA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0
5	L	50.0	L	0	1	1	0	2	6	1	0	1	0
*6	GE	16.7	PE	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	0
7	L	66.7	L	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0
8	GO	83.3	GO	0	0	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
9	PE	33.3	PE	1	2	0	4	0	0	1	0	4	0
10	L	25.0	GO	0	0	6	0	1	3	2	0	0	0
11	K	66.7	K	0	0	4	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
*12	F	8.3	SC	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	8
13	GE	33.3	GE	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	0
14	GE	41.7	GE	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2
15	J	91.7	J	0	0	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	0
16	PE	58.3	PE	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	1
*17	GO	33.3	PE	2	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	1
18	SC	75.0	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	9
19	F	75.0	F	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
20	J	91.7	J	0	0	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	0

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
21	O	0.0	PE	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	1
22	O	0.0	PE	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	1
23	L	50.0	L	0	0	1	0	1	6	1	3	0	0
24	L	50.0	L	0	1	1	0	0	6	3	1	0	0
25	K	91.7	K	0	0	0	0	11	0	1	0	0	0
26	J	25.0	PE	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	6	0
27	PE	50.0	PE	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	0
28	PA	50.0	PA	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	1	0
*29	PA	41.7	PA	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3
30	PA	75.0	PA	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	1	0
31	O	25.0	L	0	2	2	0	0	5	3	0	0	0
*32	GE	0.0	SC	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	9
33	K	58.3	K	0	1	1	0	7	1	1	0	0	1
34	J	91.7	J	0	0	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	0
35	GE	83.3	GE	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
36	F	41.7	O	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3
37	F	25.0	O	3	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
38	GE	25.0	PE	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	0
*39	GE	16.7	PA	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	0
40	PE	16.7	PA	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	2	1

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
				Number of Judgements By Category									
41	J	75.0	J	0	0	0	9	0	0	2	0	0	1
42	J	33.3	O	0	0	3	4	0	0	3	1	1	0
43	SC	83.3	SC	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10
44	SC	83.3	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	10
45	PA	83.3	PA	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	0	0
46	SC	50.0	SC	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6
47	J	16.7	O	2	1	0	2	0	0	3	0	3	1
48	J	16.7	O	0	2	1	2	0	1	5	0	1	0
49	O	50.0	O	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	0	3	0
50	K	58.3	K	0	0	4	0	7	1	0	0	0	0
51	J	33.3	K	0	1	1	4	4	1	1	0	0	0
52	SC	83.3	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	10
53	L	33.3	L	1	1	4	0	0	4	2	0	0	0
*54	J	0.0	O	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	3
55	J	16.7	O	4	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	2
56	GO	100.0	GO	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
57	K	58.3	K	0	1	0	0	7	2	2	0	0	0
58	K	50.0	K	0	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	0	0
59	K	75.0	K	0	0	1	0	9	1	1	0	0	0
60	F	25.0	O	3	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	0

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
*61	PE	8.3	PA	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	6	1	0
62	J	100.0	J	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
63	F	75.0	F	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
64	GO	75.0	GO	0	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	0
65	GE	33.3	GE	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	0
66	PA	75.0	PA	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	1	0
67	GE	25.0	L	0	3	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	1
68	SC	91.7	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11
*69	L	8.3	O	0	0	3	0	0	1	7	1	0	0
70	L	66.7	L	0	0	1	0	1	8	1	0	1	0
*71	L	25.0	K	0	1	0	0	6	3	2	0	0	0
72	O	8.3	GE	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	0
73	PE	41.7	PE	0	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	5	0
74	SC	66.7	SC	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	8
75	J	33.3	O	1	0	1	4	1	2	2	0	1	0
76	F	50.0	O	6	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0
77	PE	66.7	PE	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	8	0
*78	PE	8.3	PA	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	1	0
79	J	25.0	PA	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	6	1	1
*80	SC	50.0	SC	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
81	PE	58.3	PE	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	7	0
82	K	83.3	K	0	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	0
83	GE	41.7	GE	0	5	0	0	4	0	2	1	0	0
84	GO	41.7	O	2	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
85	GO	66.7	GO	0	0	8	0	1	0	1	2	0	0
86	K	75.0	K	0	0	0	0	9	1	1	1	0	0
*87	F	16.7	PE	2	0	0	3	0	2	1	0	4	0
88	F	100.0	F	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
89	L	25.0	L	0	2	4	0	1	3	1	1	0	0
90	GO	83.3	GO	0	0	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
91	PE	58.3	PE	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	0
92	F	33.3	O	4	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
93	SC	91.7	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11
94	L	58.3	L	0	4	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0
95	SC	83.3	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	10
96	SC	58.3	SC	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	7
97	L	41.7	K	0	0	0	0	6	5	1	0	0	0
98	O	16.7	GE	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	1
*99	PA	50.0	PA	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0
100	GO	66.7	GO	2	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
*101	SC	25.0	O	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	0	1	3
102	J	33.3	PE	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	6	0
*103	L	0.0	GE	1	2	0	0	3	0	1	2	2	1
*104	L	8.3	K	0	0	1	0	9	1	1	0	0	0
*105	PE	0.0	PA	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	9	0	0
**106	F	16.7	PE	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	7	1
107	K	50.0	K	0	2	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0
108	K	66.7	K	0	1	0	0	8	1	2	0	0	0
109	GO	58.3	GO	0	0	7	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
110	J	75.0	J	1	0	0	9	0	1	0	0	1	0
*111	F	8.3	SC	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	6
112	F	25.0	PE	3	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	4	0
113	PA	50.0	PA	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	0
114	F	100.0	F	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
115	GE	58.3	GE	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2
*116	GE	8.3	PE	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	0	6	0
*117	GE	16.7	K	0	2	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	1
118	SC	83.3	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	10
*119	SC	41.7	O	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	0	1	5
*120	SC	33.3	O	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	4

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
121	SC	75.0	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	9
122	GO	100.0	GO	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
123	O	58.3	O	0	2	1	0	1	1	7	0	0	0
124	SC	66.7	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	8
125	PA	66.7	PA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	8	1	0
126	K	83.3	K	0	1	0	0	10	0	1	0	0	0
127	L	33.3	L	3	4	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0
128	PE	50.0	PE	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	1
129	PE	66.7	PE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	2
*130	PA	50.0	PA	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	1	1
131	PA	83.3	PA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	10	0	0
132	K	83.3	K	0	0	0	0	10	1	1	0	0	0
133	PE	75.0	PE	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	0
*134	GO	25.0	SC	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	8
135	GO	100.0	GO	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
136	K	75.0	K	1	0	1	0	9	0	1	0	0	0
137	F	41.7	O	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
138	F	41.7	O	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	0
139	PA	83.3	PA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	1
*140	GE	16.7	PE	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	6	0

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
**141	PA	0.0	GE	0	7	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0
142	F	75.0	F	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
143	L	66.7	L	0	0	1	0	0	8	2	0	0	1
144	PE	58.3	PE	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	1
145	L	50.0	L	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	0
146	SC	91.7	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11
147	K	100.0	K	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0
148	PE	58.3	PE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	0
149	O	8.3	GE	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	0
*150	L	16.7	GO	0	0	8	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
151	PA	75.0	PA	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	1	0
152	F	75.0	F	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
153	K	91.7	K	1	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
154	GO	41.7	K	0	0	5	0	5	1	1	0	0	0
155	PA	58.3	PA	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	2	0
156	L	41.7	L	0	0	0	2	0	5	3	0	2	0
*157	K	50.0	K	1	2	0	0	6	1	2	0	0	0
158	K	66.7	K	0	1	1	0	8	1	1	0	0	0
*159	GO	33.3	O	1	0	4	0	3	1	2	0	0	1
160	GO	75.0	GO	0	0	9	0	1	0	2	0	0	0

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
161	GE	41.7	L	0	5	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0
162	O	16.7	K	0	0	2	0	7	1	2	0	0	0
163	PE	75.0	PE	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	0
164	L	25.0	L	1	1	0	0	4	3	1	1	1	0
165	GE	33.3	GE	0	4	1	0	0	1	5	0	1	0
*166	J	8.3	PE	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4
167	J	58.3	J	0	0	0	7	0	1	1	0	3	0
168	GE	25.0	GE	0	3	0	0	4	2	2	1	0	0
169	SC	83.3	SC	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	10
170	PA	66.7	PA	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	1	0
171	SC	91.7	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	11
172	GO	91.7	GO	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
173	O	25.0	PE	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	0
174	PE	58.3	PE	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	7	2
175	J	91.7	J	0	0	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	0
*176	K	25.0	L	0	3	0	0	3	5	1	0	0	0
177	F	66.7	F	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
178	PE	83.3	PE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	1
179	L	41.7	L	0	0	4	0	0	5	2	1	0	0
180	K	83.3	K	0	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	0

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
181	PE	50.0	PE	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	0
*182	F	8.3	SC	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	8
183	PA	75.0	PA	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	0
184	GO	58.3	GO	0	0	7	0	2	1	2	0	0	0
*185	J	8.3	PE	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	1
186	L	58.3	L	0	0	0	5	0	7	0	0	0	0
187	PA	83.3	PA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	1	0
*188	J	0.0	K	1	3	0	0	5	2	0	0	1	0
**189	PE	25.0	GE	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0
190	GE	25.0	L	0	3	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	0
*191	GO	41.7	O	4	0	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
192	GE	41.7	GE	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0
*193	GE	8.3	O	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	5
194	SC	83.3	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	10
195	F	91.7	F	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
196	GO	83.3	GO	0	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
**197	PE	16.7	GE	0	5	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	0
198	PA	66.7	PA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	3
199	SC	66.7	SC	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	8
*200	PE	8.3	GE	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4	1	0

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
201	F	100.0	F	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
*202	GO	8.3	K	0	0	1	0	8	3	0	0	0	0
203	PE	58.3	PE	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	7	0
204	J	91.7	J	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	0
205	L	58.3	L	0	1	3	0	0	7	1	0	0	0
206	PA	66.7	PA	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	1	0
207	SC	75.0	SC	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	9
208	PA	58.3	PA	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0
209	GO	50.0	GO	4	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
210	F	25.0	SC	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
211	SC	100.0	SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
212	F	100.0	F	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
213	L	75.0	L	0	0	2	0	1	9	0	0	0	0
214	PA	66.7	PA	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	2	0
215	GO	91.7	GO	0	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
216	GE	25.0	J	0	3	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	0
217	GE	41.7	GE	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	4	0
*218	GE	0.0	L	0	0	1	0	1	5	1	3	1	0
219	PA	75.0	PA	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	0
*220	SC	50.0	SC	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	6

Item	Key	Percent	Judged Category	Number of Judgements By Category									
				F	GE	GO	J	K	L	O	PA	PE	SC
*221	K	58.3	K	0	0	0	0	7	1	3	0	0	1
*222	K	50.0	K	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	1	0	0
223	L	58.3	L	0	0	0	0	3	7	1	0	1	0
224	J	25.0	GE	0	4	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	0
*225	J	8.3	O	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	2
226	PE	41.7	PE	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4
227	K	75.0	K	0	0	0	2	0	9	1	0	0	0
228	GE	41.7	L	0	5	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0
229	F	58.3	F	7	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
230	PA	91.7	PA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0
231	GO	100.0	GO	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
**232	K	33.3	GE	0	4	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0
233	K	58.3	K	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0
234	GO	75.0	GO	0	0	0	9	0	3	0	0	0	0
235	GO	66.7	GO	0	0	8	0	1	3	0	0	0	0

* Item rejected
**Item moved to another category

APPENDIX B: Letter To Expert Judges Panel

RR #1, Site 6, Box 4
Carvel, Alberta
Canada, T0E 0H0
res: 403 963-3789
off: 403 469-0517

September 5, 1990

Dear __________:

Subject: Christian Lifestyle Inventory:
Item Judgements

I want to thank you for your interest and commitment in this project. You will find a list of definitions of the "Fruit of the Spirit" and the document of items enclosed.

Please review the definitions carefully. The judgements you are about to make on each of the items must be based on these definitions rather than on your own concept of each of these terms.

Your task is to make a judgement on each item and decide which one of the nine categories it belongs to. I have also included a number of **"bogus items"** which you may designate as belonging to an **"other"** category. You may have noticed that some of the items are followed by (R) which simply means that it will be "reverse scored. For your information, the 600-800 subjects in this study will be asked to respond to each of these items with the following response format:

Definitely characteristic of me
Usually characteristic of me
Unsure
Usually uncharacteristic of me
Definitely uncharacteristic of me

Please mark your decisions in the left margin of the item document beside each item using the following abbreviations:

Love................L
Joy.................J
Peace...............Pe
Patience............Pa
Kindness............K
Goodness............Go
Faithfulness........F
Gentleness..........Ge
Self Control........SC
Other...............O

In addition to the above, I would appreciate any comments you may have on specific items that may be too vague, biased, or subject to creating artificial error. Please write your comments in the right margin and on the back of each page.

Please mail your completed forms to me at the above address within one week. You may phone me (collect) at the above numbers if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Dave W. Stensland, M.S.

APPENDIX C: Christian Lifestyle Inventory Items

TABLE C-1 Christian Lifestyle Inventory:
Experimental Questionnaire Edition

Please respond to each of the statements below by marking one of the following on score sheet # 1:

a = Definitely characteristic of me
b = Usually characteristic of me
c = Unsure if this is characteristic of me or not
d = Usually uncharacteristic of me
e = Definitely uncharacteristic of me

1. I take action to oppose what I think is wrong in society.
2. People confide in me often.
3. I worry about what my neighbors think of me.
4. There are at least two major areas of my life that I don't seem to get under control very well.
5. I spend a lot of my money on other people.
6. I can't handle being around people who are dying or seriously ill.
7. I tend to see what goes wrong more often than what goes right.
8. I am fairly tense most of the time.
9. It's hard for me to be patient.
10. I get upset with people who don't show their appreciation for what I do for them.
11. My faith involves all of my life.
12. I give money to provide disaster relief to people.
13. I am firm in my beliefs and live them consistently.
14. I get upset when my opinions are questioned.
15. I just can't say no to some temptations.
16. When someone presents me with strong arguments, I usually try to settle on some middle ground.

17. I really enjoy listening to other people tell about themselves.

18. If it weren't for my friends I don't think I could keep going.

19. I worry about a lot of things.

20. People who should know better really get on my nerves.

21. I don't go out of my way to find ways to do things for others.

22. One should seek God's guidance when making every important decision.

23. I attend candidate forums and always vote in local, regional, and national elections, when possible.

24. When I tell someone I'll do something for them, they can count on it.

25. I'm good at keeping my feelings to myself.

26. I tend to get the "bug", and buy things on impulse.

27. Most people are honest enough that I would let them work in my home without close supervision.

28. I don't like people who swear a lot.

29. I see goodness in more things than most people.

30. If I were given six months to live I would change my lifestyle dramatically.

31. I just can't hold my tongue when people make foolish and costly mistakes.

32. People ask me to help them quite often.

33. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.

34. I give money to at least three charities annually.

35. I break promises more often than I should.

36. I keep my distance with people.

37. I procrastinate on too many things.

38. I am only very rarely in a position where I feel a need to actively argue for a point of view I hold.

39. I think about people suffering in other parts of the world several times a week.

40. I seem to really enjoy living more than most people.

41. I wish my conscience wouldn't bother me so much.

42. I have a lot of tolerance of inconsiderate people.

43. I keep in touch with people who need help in some way.

44. My faith sometimes restricts my actions.

45. When I see someone taking advantage of others, I do something about it.

46. People seem to trust me a lot.

47. Relationships work well for me.

48. I've worked out a budget and am pretty good at sticking to it.

49. If faced by a good argument, I am usually willing to change my position even on important issues.

50. I am concerned for the well-being of others, regardless of whether I like them or not.

51. My smile is only on the outside, much of the time.

52. I have trouble making up my mind on personal matters.

53. I get even with people who treat me unfairly.

54. I invite people to live in my home if they need a place to stay.

55. Nothing is as important to me as serving God as best as I know how.

56. I am not one to express my concerns on moral issues.

57. I am a dependable person.

58. I am a private person.

59. I use my credit card to buy things I otherwise couldn't afford.

60. I believe most of the people with whom I am in contact, ignore any minor errors I make.

61. I admire handicapped people.

62. I rarely go a whole day without being thankful for something.

63. There is something significant lacking in my inner life.

64. I tolerate unfairness very well.

65. It kind of irks me to take time from my busy schedule to help people who don't help themselves.

66. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in life.

67. I bring errors to the attention of the cashier in stores where they under-charge me.

68. I am good at following through with my commitments.

69. Intimacy is not one of my well developed gifts.

70. I manage my time very well.

71. I object to answering questions about my family or friends when applying for a job.

72. I share the pain of those who are struggling.

73. I love a celebration.

74. It's hard for me to make up my mind.

75. I don't take "guff" from anyone.

76. I choose to give people money when they need it, rather than lend it to them.

77. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.

78. I take individual action to assist the police in stopping crime.

79. I wish people wouldn't depend on me so much.

80. It's really important for me to be right.

81. I am careful to eat nutritious balanced meals, and avoid snacks between meals.

82. I believe that only a small part of the criticism I receive can be used to my advantage by helping me to improve myself.

83. Most of my prayers are about personal matters.

84. I am a happy person inside.

85. I am content with my life.

86. I give people a second chance.

87. I spend time with people who are hurting.

88. In my life I experience the presence of the Divine.

89. I do volunteer work in my community.

90. I make an effort to carry my share of the workload.

91. I'm good at laughing at my own mistakes.

92. I make sure I get enough exercise.

93. I am not very insistent in an argument.

94. I think most people on unemployment benefits are lazy.

95. I am known as a thankful person.

96. I like the way I live.

97. I tolerate difficult relationships better than most people.

98. It bothers me to keep on inviting people to my home, when they never invite me to their home.

99. Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.

100. I sometimes "cheat" or "bend the rules" in order to get ahead.

101. I don't go back on my word.

102. My sense of self-worth is low.

103. I spend more money than I should on entertainment and other things I like to do.

104. I don't like people to joke about what I feel are my shortcomings.

105. I think people who are down and out usually ask for it.

106. I need a lot of encouragement from others.

107. I'm good at resolving my conflicts with others.

108. I choose not to get even with people who take advantage of me.

109. I do helpful things for other people almost every day.

110. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.

111. I take from this world more than I contribute to it.

112. I am often asked to take responsibility for things.

113. I handle criticism very well.

114. Once I sit down in front of the T.V., I just can't seem to get up and shut it off.

115. I think there ought to be a law against homosexuals.

116. Even when the going gets tough, I can keep going.

117. I'm good at helping others settle their differences.

118. It is not difficult for me to forgive mean and unkind people.

119. I do things for people, anonymously.

120. I am known as a fair person.

121. I am known as a person who gets things done.

122. I care a lot about the feelings of others.

123. I get side-tracked or distracted from the things I should be doing.

124. I think gays and lesbians have a difficult life to live.

125. People like to be around me.

126. People get me upset quite often.

127. I consider the needs of others before reacting to their hurtful behavior.

128. I am known as one who does things for others.

129. I spend time helping less fortunate groups of people.

130. Dependability is not one of my strengths.

131. I very much want to be more tender and understanding.

132. I have a hard time getting rid of bad habits.

133. I think the majority of people who join protest rallies are just looking for attention.

134. People avoid me when they are down.

135. I feel guilty quite often.

136. I am forgiving when someone in a position of authority is mean or unfair to me.

137. I sacrifice for the benefit of others.

138. I take action to preserve the environment.

139. I practice what I preach.

140. I work hard at listening carefully before I speak.

141. I am very successful at making changes in my life.

142. I feel left behind when good things happen to others.

143. I am fun to be around.

144. I seem to be misunderstood more than most people.

145. I am not very forgiving when a neighbour is unfair to me.

146. I am so busy I don't have time to do things for others.

147. I do not knowingly do things that harm the earth's environment.

148. People seem to have a lot of confidence in me.

149. I would not describe myself as a tender person.

150. I'm good at self-discipline.

151. I steer clear of people who are going through difficult times.

152. I have a well developed sense of humour.

153. I do forgive myself for making mistakes and using poor judgment.

154. I am forgiving when a close family member is mean or unfair to me.

155. When something needs doing, I am one of the first persons they ask.

156. I think the little bit I might do to help preserve the environment is so minor that it just isn't worth my effort.

157. I believe that God or a higher power takes a personal interest in me.

158. Others seem to think I am an inconsiderate person.

159. I am more self-indulgent than I should be.

160. I like celebrating people's accomplishments with them.

161. Thinking about the future makes me uneasy.

162. I have a clear awareness of my purpose in life.

163. I am forgiving when a close friend is unfair to me.

164. I spend at least three hours per week doing things for specific people above and beyond my usual responsibilities.

165. There are times when I just have to stand up for what is right in this world.

166. My personal integrity and honesty is not as consistent as my friends think it is.

167. Most people seem to feel particularly safe and comfortable around me.

168. Sexual temptation is not a struggle for me.

169. I'm secretly pleased when someone else makes a foolish mistake.

170. I tend to be a negative thinker.

171. I am ashamed of myself more often than not.

172. I give people the benefit of the doubt when they are late and keep me waiting.

173. I guess I am more of a "taker" than a "giver" with people close to me.

174. I don't waste my time trying to influence government decisions.

175. I often just wish people would find someone else to depend on.

176. I don't mind listening to people's troubles.

177. I do things repeatedly that cause me to feel ashamed of myself.

178. I tend to trust people easily.

179. I cope with minor disappointments and frustrating events very well.

180. I am not sure what I should do with my life.

181. I just can't resist getting even with some people.

182. I am less sensitive than most people to the practical needs of others.

183. I am willing to risk arrest to make my community and country a better place to live.

184. I am a very loyal person.

185. I apologize to people I've treated unfairly.

186. I handle my anger very well.

187. I have friends whose ethnic background is different from mine.

188. I am moody and not a pleasant person to be around.

189. I wish I were somebody else.

190. I am easy going, even with difficult people.

191. Serving others in practical ways is my strongest gift.

192. I prefer to deal with my own affairs than get involved in community projects.

193. People seem reluctant to trust me with important things.

194. I seem to upset others quite often.

195. I can stick to my plans very well.

196. I have quite a bit of racial prejudice in me.

197. I seem to be sad or depressed more than most people I know.

198. There is something quite solid and stable about my life.

199. I choose to let nasty or unfair actions pass without retaliating.

200. I don't mind helping people who cannot return the favor.

TABLE C-2 Experimental Items Listed by Category

GOODNESS

1. I take action to oppose what I think is wrong in society.

12. I give money to provide disaster relief to people.

23. I attend candidate forums and always vote in local, regional, and national elections, when possible.

34. I give money to at least three charities annually.

45. When I see someone taking advantage of others, I do something about it.

56. I am not one to express my concerns on moral issues.(R)

67. I bring errors to the attention of the cashier in stores where they under-charge me.

78. I take individual action to assist the police in stopping crime.

89. I do volunteer work in my community.

100. I sometimes "cheat" or "bend the rules" in order to get ahead.(R)

111. I take from this world more than I contribute to it.(R)

120. I am known as a fair person.

129. I spend time helping less fortunate groups of people.

138. I take action to preserve the environment.

147. I do not knowingly do things that harm the earth's environment.

156. I think the little bit I might do to help preserve the environment is so minor that it just isn't worth my effort.(R)

165. There are times when I just have to stand up for what is right in this world.

174. I don't waste my time trying to influence government decisions.(R)

183. I am willing to risk arrest to make my community and country a better place to live.

192. I prefer to deal with my own affairs than get involved in community projects.(R)

FAITHFULNESS

2. People confide in me often.

13. I am firm in my beliefs and live them consistently.

24. When I tell someone I'll do something for them, they can count on it.

35. I break promises more often than I should.(R)

46. People seem to trust me a lot.

57. I am a dependable person.

68. I am good at following through with my commitments.

79. I wish people wouldn't depend on me so much.(R)

90. I make an effort to carry my share of the workload.

101. I don't go back on my word.

112. I am often asked to take responsibility for things.

121. I am known as a person who gets things done.

130. Dependability is not one of my strengths.(R)

139. I practice what I preach.

148. People seem to have a lot of confidence in me.

157. I believe that God or a higher power takes a personal interest in me.

166. My personal integrity and honesty is not as consistent as my friends think it is.(R)

175. I often just wish people would find someone else to depend on.(R)

184. I am a very loyal person.

193. People seem reluctant to trust me with important things.(R)

GENTLENESS

3. I worry about what my neighbors think of me.(R)
14. I get upset when my opinions are questioned.(R)
25. I'm good at keeping my feelings to myself.(R)
36. I keep my distance with people.(R)
47. Relationships work well for me.
58. I am a private person.(R)
69. Intimacy is not one of my well developed gifts.(R)
80. It's really important for me to be right.(R)
91. I'm good at laughing at my own mistakes.
102. My sense of self-worth is low.(R)
113. I handle criticism very well.
122. I care a lot about the feelings of others.
131. I very much want to be more tender and understanding.
140. I work hard at listening carefully before I speak.
149. I would not describe myself as a tender person.(R)
158. Others seem to think I am an inconsiderate person.(R)
167. Most people seem to feel particularly safe and comfortable around me.
176. I don't mind listening to people's troubles.
185. I apologize to people I've treated unfairly.
194. I seem to upset others quite often.(R)

SELF CONTROL

4. There are at least two major areas of my life that I don't seem to get under control very well.(R)

15. I just can't say no to some temptations.(R)

26. I tend to get the "bug", and buy things on impulse.(R)

37. I procrastinate on too many things.(R)

48. I've worked out a budget and am pretty good at sticking to it.

59. I use my credit card to buy things I otherwise couldn't afford.(R)

70. I manage my time very well.

81. I am careful to eat nutritious balanced meals, and avoid snacks between meals.

92. I make sure I get enough exercise.

103. I spend more money than I should on entertainment and other things I like to do.(R)

114. Once I sit down in front of the T.V., I just can't seem to get up and shut it off.(R)

123. I get side-tracked or distracted from the things I should be doing.(R)

132. I have a hard time getting rid of bad habits.(R)

141. I am very successful at making changes in my life.

150. I'm good at self-discipline.

159. I am more self-indulgent than I should be.(R)

168. Sexual temptation is not a struggle for me.

177. I do things repeatedly that cause me to feel ashamed of myself.(R)

186. I handle my anger very well.

195. I can stick to my plans very well.

DESIRABILITY

5. I spend a lot of my money on other people.

16. When someone presents me with strong arguments, I usually try to settle on some middle ground.

27. Most people are honest enough that I would let them work in my home without close supervision.

38. I am only very rarely in a position where I feel a need to actively argue for a point of view I hold.

49. If faced by a good argument, I am usually willing to change my position even on important issues.

60. I believe most of the people with whom I am in contact, ignore any minor errors I make.

71. I object to answering questions about my family or friends when applying for a job.(R)

82. I believe that only a small part of the criticism I receive can be used to my advantage by helping me to improve myself.(R)

93. I am not very insistent in an argument.

104. I don't like people to joke about what I feel are my shortcomings.(R)

LOVE

6. I can't handle being around people who are dying or seriously ill.(R)

17. I really enjoy listening to other people tell about themselves.

28. I don't like people who swear a lot.(R)

39. I think about people suffering in other parts of the world several times a week.

50. I am concerned for the well-being of others, regardless of whether I like them or not.

61. I admire handicapped people.

72. I share the pain of those who are struggling.

83. Most of my prayers are about personal matters.(R)

94. I think most people on unemployment benefits are lazy.(R)

105. I think people who are down and out usually ask for it.(R)

115. I think there ought to be a law against homosexuals.(R)

124. I think gays and lesbians have a difficult life to live.

133. I think the majority of people who join protest rallies are just looking for attention.(R)

142. I feel left behind when good things happen to others.(R)

151. I steer clear of people who are going through difficult times.(R)

160. I like celebrating people's accomplishments with them.

169. I'm secretly pleased when someone else makes a foolish mistake.(R)

178. I tend to trust people easily.

187. I have friends whose ethnic background is different from mine.

196. I have quite a bit of racial prejudice in me.(R)

JOY

7. I tend to see what goes wrong more often than what goes right.(R)

18. If it weren't for my friends I don't think I could keep going.(R)

29. I see goodness in more things than most people.

40. I seem to really enjoy living more than most people.

51. My smile is only on the outside, much of the time. (R)

62. I rarely go a whole day without being thankful for something.

73. I love a celebration.

84. I am a happy person inside.

95. I am known as a thankful person.

106. I need a lot of encouragement from others. (R)

116. Even when the going gets tough, I can keep going.

125. People like to be around me.

134. People avoid me when they are down.(R)

143. I am fun to be around.

152. I have a well developed sense of humour.

161. Thinking about the future makes me uneasy.(R)

170. I tend to be a negative thinker.(R)

179. I cope with minor disappointments and frustrating events very well.

188. I am moody and not a pleasant person to be around.(R)

197. I seem to be sad or depressed more than most people I know.(R)

PEACE

8. I am fairly tense most of the time.(R)

19. I worry about a lot of things.(R)

30. If I were given six months to live I would change my lifestyle dramatically.(R)

41. I wish my conscience wouldn't bother me so much.(R)

52. I have trouble making up my mind on personal matters.(R)

63. There is something significant lacking in my inner life.(R)

74. It's hard for me to make up my mind.(R)

85. I am content with my life.

96. I like the way I live.

107. I'm good at resolving my conflicts with others.

117. I'm good at helping others settle their differences.

126. People get me upset quite often.(R)

135. I feel guilty quite often.(R)

144. I seem to be misunderstood more than most people.(R)

153. I do forgive myself for making mistakes and using poor judgment.

162. I have a clear awareness of my purpose in life.

171. I am ashamed of myself more often than not.(R)

180. I am not sure what I should do with my life.(R)

189. I wish I were somebody else.(R)

198. There is something quite solid and stable about my life.

PATIENCE

9. It's hard for me to be patient.(R)

20. People who should know better really get on my nerves. (R)

31. I just can't hold my tongue when people make foolish and costly mistakes.(R)

42. I have a lot of tolerance of inconsiderate people.

53. I get even with people who treat me unfairly.(R)

64. I tolerate unfairness very well.

75. I don't take "guff" from anyone.(R)

86. I give people a second chance.

97. I tolerate difficult relationships better than most people.

108. I choose not to get even with people who take advantage of me.

118. It is not difficult for me to forgive mean and unkind people.

127. I consider the needs of others before reacting to their hurtful behavior.

136. I am forgiving when someone in a position of authority is mean or unfair to me.

145. I am not very forgiving when a neighbour is unfair to me.(R)

154. I am forgiving when a close family member is mean or unfair to me.

163. I am forgiving when a close friend is unfair to me.

172. I give people the benefit of the doubt when they are late and keep me waiting.

181. I just can't resist getting even with some people.(R)

190. I am easy going, even with difficult people.

199. I choose to let nasty or unfair actions pass without retaliating.

KINDNESS

10. I get upset with people who don't show their appreciation for what I do for them.(R)

21. I don't go out of my way to find ways to do things for others.(R)

32. People ask me to help them quite often.

43. I keep in touch with people who need help in some way.

54. I invite people to live in my home if they need a place to stay.

65. It kind of irks me to take time from my busy schedule to help people who don't help themselves.(R)

76. I choose to give people money when they need it, rather than lend it to them.

87. I spend time with people who are hurting.

98. It bothers me to keep on inviting people to my home, when they never invite me to their home.(R)

109. I do helpful things for other people almost every day.

119. I do things for people, anonymously.

128. I am known as one who does things for others.

137. I sacrifice for the benefit of others.

146. I am so busy I don't have time to do things for others.(R)

155. When something needs doing, I am one of the first persons they ask.

164. I spend at least three hours per week doing things for specific people above and beyond my usual responsibilities.

173. I guess I am more of a "taker" than a "giver" with people close to me.(R)

182. I am less sensitive than most people to the practical needs of others.(R)

191. Serving others in practical ways is my strongest gift.

200. I don't mind helping people who cannot return the favor.

HOGE INTRINSIC RELIGIOUS MOTIVATION SCALE

11. My faith involves all of my life.

22. One should seek God's guidance when making every important decision.

33. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.(R)

44. My faith sometimes restricts my actions.

55. Nothing is as important to me as serving God as best as I know how.

66. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in life.(R)

77. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.

88. In my life I experience the presence of the Divine.

99. Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.(R)

110. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.

TABLE C-3 Christian Lifestyle Inventory
Final Items

GOODNESS

1. I take action to oppose what I think is wrong in society.

12. I give money to provide disaster relief to people.

23. I attend candidate forums and always vote in local, regional, and national elections, when possible.

34. I give money to at least three charities annually.

45. When I see someone taking advantage of others, I do something about it.

56. I am not one to express my concerns on moral issues.(R)

78. I take individual action to assist the police in stopping crime.

89. I do volunteer work in my community.

129. I spend time helping less fortunate groups of people.

138. I take action to preserve the environment.

156. I think the little bit I might do to help preserve the environment is so minor that it just isn't worth my effort.(R)

165. There are times when I just have to stand up for what is right in this world.

174. I don't waste my time trying to influence government decisions.(R)

183. I am willing to risk arrest to make my community and country a better place to live.

192. I prefer to deal with my own affairs than get involved in community projects.(R)

DELETED ITEMS:

67. I bring errors to the attention of the cashier in stores where they under-charge me.

100. I sometimes "cheat" or "bend the rules" in order to get ahead.(R)

111. I take from this world more than I contribute to it.(R)

120. I am known as a fair person.

147. I do not knowingly do things that harm the earth's environment.

FAITHFULNESS

13. I am firm in my beliefs and live them consistently.

24. When I tell someone I'll do something for them, they can count on it.

35. I break promises more often than I should.(R)

46. People seem to trust me a lot.

57. I am a dependable person.

68. I am good at following through with my commitments.

90. I make an effort to carry my share of the workload.

101. I don't go back on my word.

112. I am often asked to take responsibility for things.

121. I am known as a person who gets things done.

130. Dependability is not one of my strengths.(R)

139. I practice what I preach.

148. People seem to have a lot of confidence in me.

166. My personal integrity and honesty is not as consistent as my friends think it is.(R)

184. I am a very loyal person.

193. People seem reluctant to trust me with important things.(R)

MOVED OUT ITEMS:

2. People confide in me often. (to kindness)

DELETED ITEMS:

79. I wish people wouldn't depend on me so much.(R)

157. I believe that God or a higher power takes a personal interest in me.

175. I often just wish people would find someone else to depend on.(R)

GENTLENESS

14. I get upset when my opinions are questioned.(R)

36. I keep my distance with people.(R)

47. Relationships work well for me.

58. I am a private person.(R)

69. Intimacy is not one of my well developed gifts.(R)

73. I love a celebration. (from Joy)

91. I'm good at laughing at my own mistakes.

107. I'm good at resolving my conflicts with others. (from Peace)

113. I handle criticism very well.

122. I care a lot about the feelings of others.

125. People like to be around me. (from Joy)

140. I work hard at listening carefully before I speak.

149. I would not describe myself as a tender person.(R)

158. Others seem to think I am an inconsiderate person.(R)

160. I like celebrating people's accomplishments with them. (from Love)

167. Most people seem to feel particularly safe and comfortable around me.

176. I don't mind listening to people's troubles.

185. I apologize to people I've treated unfairly.

194. I seem to upset others quite often.(R)

ADDED ITEMS:

73. I love a celebration. (from Joy)

125. People like to be around me. (from Joy)

107. I'm good at resolving my conflicts with others. (from Peace)

160. I like celebrating people's accomplishments with them. (from Love)

MOVED OUT ITEMS:

102. My sense of self-worth is low.(R) (to Peace)

DELETED ITEMS:

3. I worry about what my neighbors think of me.(R)

25. I'm good at keeping my feelings to myself.(R)

80. It's really important for me to be right.(R)

131. I very much want to be more tender and understanding.

SELF-CONTROL

4. There are at least two major areas of my life that I don't seem to get under control very well.(R)

15. I just can't say no to some temptations.(R)

26. I tend to get the "bug", and buy things on impulse.(R)

37. I procrastinate on too many things.(R)

48. I've worked out a budget and am pretty good at sticking to it.

59. I use my credit card to buy things I otherwise couldn't afford.(R)

70. I manage my time very well.

81. I am careful to eat nutritious balanced meals, and avoid snacks between meals.

92. I make sure I get enough exercise.

103. I spend more money than I should on entertainment and other things I like to do.(R)

114. Once I sit down in front of the T.V., I just can't seem to get up and shut it off.(R)

123. I get side-tracked or distracted from the things I should be doing.(R)

132. I have a hard time getting rid of bad habits.(R)

150. I'm good at self-discipline.

159. I am more self-indulgent than I should be.(R)

195. I can stick to my plans very well.

MOVED OUT ITEMS:

177. I do things repeatedly that cause me to feel ashamed of myself.(R) (moved to Peace)

186. I handle my anger very well. (moved to Patience)

DELETED ITEMS:

141. I am very successful at making changes in my life.

168. Sexual temptation is not a struggle for me.

LOVE

6. I can't handle being around people who are dying or seriously ill.(R)

17. I really enjoy listening to other people tell about themselves.

39. I think about people suffering in other parts of the world several times a week.

50. I am concerned for the well-being of others, regardless of whether I like them or not.

61. I admire handicapped people.

72. I share the pain of those who are struggling.

83. Most of my prayers are about personal matters.(R)

94. I think most people on unemployment benefits are lazy.(R)

105. I think people who are down and out usually ask for it.(R)

115. I think there ought to be a law against homosexuals.(R)

133. I think the majority of people who join protest rallies are just looking for attention.(R)

151. I steer clear of people who are going through difficult times.(R)

169. I'm secretly pleased when someone else makes a foolish mistake.(R)

187. I have friends whose ethnic background is different from mine.

196. I have quite a bit of racial prejudice in me.(R)

MOVED OUT ITEMS:

160. I like celebrating people's accomplishments with them. (to Gentleness)

DELETED ITEMS:

28. I don't like people who swear a lot.(R)

124. I think gays and lesbians have a difficult life to live.

142. I feel left behind when good things happen to others.(R)

178. I tend to trust people easily.

JOY

7. I tend to see what goes wrong more often than what goes right.(R)

29. I see goodness in more things than most people.

40. I seem to really enjoy living more than most people.

62. I rarely go a whole day without being thankful for something.

84. I am a happy person inside.

95. I am known as a thankful person.

106. I need a lot of encouragement from others. (R)

116. Even when the going gets tough, I can keep going.

134. People avoid me when they are down.(R)

143. I am fun to be around.

152. I have a well developed sense of humour.

161. Thinking about the future makes me uneasy.(R)

170. I tend to be a negative thinker.(R)

179. I cope with minor disappointments and frustrating events very well.

188. I am moody and not a pleasant person to be around.(R)

197. I seem to be sad or depressed more than most people I know.(R)

MOVED OUT ITEMS:

51. My smile is only on the outside, much of the time. (R) (moved to Peace)

73. I love a celebration. (moved to Gentleness)

125. People like to be around me. (moved to Gentleness)

DELETED ITEMS:

18. If it weren't for my friends I don't think I could keep going. (R)

PEACE

8. I am fairly tense most of the time.(R)

19. I worry about a lot of things.(R)

41. I wish my conscience wouldn't bother me so much.(R)

51. My smile is only on the outside, much of the time. (R) (from Joy)

52. I have trouble making up my mind on personal matters.(R)

63. There is something significant lacking in my inner life.(R)

85. I am content with my life.

102. My sense of self-worth is low.(R) (from Gentleness)

126. People get me upset quite often.(R)

135. I feel guilty quite often.(R)

144. I seem to be misunderstood more than most people.(R)

153. I do forgive myself for making mistakes and using poor judgment.

162. I have a clear awareness of my purpose in life.

171. I am ashamed of myself more often than not.(R)

177. I do things repeatedly that cause me to feel ashamed of myself.(R) (from SC)

180. I am not sure what I should do with my life.(R)

189. I wish I were somebody else.(R)

198. There is something quite solid and stable about my life.

ADDED ITEMS:

51. My smile is only on the outside, much of the time. (R) (from Joy)

102. My sense of self-worth is low. (R) (from Gentleness)

177. I do things repeatedly that cause me to feel ashamed of myself. (R) (from SC)

MOVED OUT ITEMS:

107. I'm good at resolving my conflicts with others. (moved to Gentleness)

DELETED ITEMS:

30. If I were given six months to live I would change my lifestyle dramatically. (R)

74. It's hard for me to make up my mind. (R)

96. I like the way I live.

117. I'm good at helping others settle their differences.

PATIENCE

9. It's hard for me to be patient.(R)

20. People who should know better really get on my nerves. (R)

31. I just can't hold my tongue when people make foolish and costly mistakes.(R)

42. I have a lot of tolerance of inconsiderate people.

75. I don't take "guff" from anyone.(R)

86. I give people a second chance.

97. I tolerate difficult relationships better than most people.

108. I choose not to get even with people who take advantage of me.

118. It is not difficult for me to forgive mean and unkind people.

127. I consider the needs of others before reacting to their hurtful behavior.

136. I am forgiving when someone in a position of authority is mean or unfair to me.

145. I am not very forgiving when a neighbour is unfair to me.(R)

154. I am forgiving when a close family member is mean or unfair to me.

163. I am forgiving when a close friend is unfair to me.

172. I give people the benefit of the doubt when they are late and keep me waiting.

181. I just can't resist getting even with some people.(R)

186. I handle my anger very well. (moved from SC)

190. I am easy going, even with difficult people.

199. I choose to let nasty or unfair actions pass without retaliating.

ADDED ITEMS:

186. I handle my anger very well. (moved from SC)

DELETED ITEMS:

53. I get even with people who treat me unfairly.(R)

64. I tolerate unfairness very well.

KINDNESS

2. People confide in me often. (from Faithful)

21. I don't go out of my way to find ways to do things for others.(R)

32. People ask me to help them quite often.

43. I keep in touch with people who need help in some way.

54. I invite people to live in my home if they need a place to stay.

87. I spend time with people who are hurting.

109. I do helpful things for other people almost every day.

119. I do things for people, anonymously.

128. I am known as one who does things for others.

137. I sacrifice for the benefit of others.

146. I am so busy I don't have time to do things for others.(R)

155. When something needs doing, I am one of the first persons they ask.

164. I spend at least three hours per week doing things for specific people above and beyond my usual responsibilities.

182. I am less sensitive than most people to the practical needs of others.(R)

191. Serving others in practical ways is my strongest gift.

200. I don't mind helping people who cannot return the favor.

ADDED ITEMS FROM OTHER CATEGORY:

2. People confide in me often. (from Faithful)

DELETED ITEMS:

10. I get upset with people who don't show their appreciation for what I do for them.(R)

65. It kind of irks me to take time from my busy schedule to help people who don't help themselves.(R)

76. I choose to give people money when they need it, rather than lend it to them.

98. It bothers me to keep on inviting people to my home, when they never invite me to their home.(R)

173. I guess I am more of a "taker" than a "giver" with people close to me.(R)

APPENDIX D: Letter to Church Leaders

August, 1990

Dear __________:

Research Project: The Development of a
Christian Lifestyle Inventory

This letter is in follow up to our meeting last week where I outlined this research project which is the topic of my dissertation to complete a Ph. D. in Counselling Psychology at the University of Alberta.

My purpose in contacting you at this stage is two-fold: The first is to inquire about the possibility of funding for this project which is estimated at $11,000. The second is to obtain some direction from you with respect to specific congregations that would be willing to participate as subjects in the study. I am hoping to obtain 600-800 subjects from the full range of Christian traditions in the greater Edmonton area. It would be my intention to work directly with the clergy from those congregations in arranging the details of data collection. The time involved for each participating subject to complete the questionnaires is estimated to be two hours.

> ". . . I am come that they might have life,
> and that they might have it more abundantly
> (to the full, overflowing)" John 10:10.

Nowhere is "living to the full" better described than in the Fruit of the Spirit of Galatians 5:22-23. Here we find the potential for life to be surrounded with love from God to us, allowing a deep sense of joy and peace that results in relationships that are held together with patience, kindness, goodness and a consistent sensitivity with others. It can be a life undergirded by a sense of being in charge of oneself through balanced and disciplined self-control.

The purpose of this research is to develop a scale that will measure the extent to which the nine Christian values of the "Fruit of the Spirit" (love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control) influence the lifestyles of people. These specific values were selected because of their universal applicability to all Christian traditions.

This study is relatively unique in the psychological literature of religiosity scales (of which there are hundreds) in that the definitions of the traits to be measured are derived directly from Scripture through exegetical analysis. It is also unique in theological circles because it utilizes the rigorous and stringent construct validation procedures used in personality test construction.

There appears to be a broad range of application of a scale of this kind. It may become one of the tools available to Pastoral Counsellors in their work with individuals and couples. It may also be useful within an adult education context to assist in the teaching of Christian values. The scale may prove to be useful in matching prospective clergy to congregations or understanding similarities and differences between congregations within a given church district. Finally, this scale may have application at a research level helping to understand differences between denominations or between church attenders and non-attenders, or even between different occupational groups. The scale may be useful in measuring change over time in individuals and groups.

By way of a brief biographical sketch, you may be interested to know that I was born and raised in Edmonton. My father was an ordained Lutheran pastor and missionary. I obtained my original university training in Speech Pathology and Audiology at Moorhead State University, Oregon College of Education and the University of Oregon/University of Oregon Medical School from 1961 to 1969. In 1984, I returned to graduate study to pursue a Ph. D. in Counselling Psychology and have been working as a Marriage and Family Therapist with Cornerstone Counselling Centre since 1986. I am married and have four children, of whom two have already "left the nest". We are members of Immanuel Lutheran Church of Rosenthal, near Stony Plain, where we attend regularly.

I trust this information will be helpful to you in preparing the way for further participation in this study. I am enclosing the definitions of the nine values/virtues for your information. I want to thank you for the encouragement and support you have already extended to me.

Sincerely,

Dave. W. Stensland, M.S.

APPENDIX E: Letter to Pastors

October 15, 1991

Dear ___________:

Research Project: Christian Lifestyle Inventory

As I mentioned to you on the phone, this research project is the topic of my dissertation to complete a Ph. D. in Counselling Psychology at the University of Alberta.

The purpose of this research project is to develop a scale that will measure the extent to which the nine Christian values of the "Fruit of the Spirit" (love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control) influence the lifestyles of people. These specific values were selected because of their universal applicability to all Christian traditions.

This study is relatively unique in the psychological literature of religiosity scales (of which there are hundreds) in that the definitions of the traits to be measured are derived directly from Scripture through exegetical analysis. It is also unique in theological circles because it utilizes the rigorous and stringent construct validation procedures used in personality test construction.

There appears to be a broad range of application of a scale of this kind. It may become one of the tools available to Pastoral Counsellors in their work with individuals and couples. It may also be useful within an adult education context to assist in the teaching of Christian values. The scale may prove to be useful in matching prospective clergy to congregations or understanding similarities and differences between congregations within a given church district. Finally, this scale may have application at a research level helping to understand differences between denominations or between church attenders and non-attenders, or even between different occupational groups. The scale may be useful in measuring change over time in individuals and groups.

My specific purpose in contacting you is to obtain adult (eighteen years and over) volunteers who would be interested in participating in a study of this kind. I am contacting approximately sixty churches in eight other denominations and expect to obtain close to 1000 Subjects to participate in this project. The task will take an average of one to two hours of time to fill out questionnaire(s). The results will be analyzed to determine which items in the scale should be kept or eliminated. If the overall results of this study yield a scale of sufficient validity, it may be possible to provide individual Subjects with a "confidential" copy of their own profile, if they want one.

By way of a brief biographical sketch, you may be interested to know that I was born and raised in Edmonton. My father was an ordained Lutheran pastor and missionary. I obtained my original university training in Speech Pathology and Audiology at Moorhead State University, Oregon College of Education and the University of Oregon/University of Oregon Medical School from 1961 to 1969. In 1984, I returned to graduate study to pursue a Ph. D. in Counselling Psychology and have been working as a Marriage and Family Therapist with Cornerstone Counselling Centre since 1986. I am married and have four children, of whom two have already "left the nest". We are members of Immanuel Lutheran Church of Rosenthal, near Stony Plain, where we attend regularly.

I am enclosing the following documents for your information:

Abstract of the study
Agreement to Participate Form
Sample bulletin insert
Feedback Profile Request Form
List of definitions

I am attaching 4~ questionnaire packets for your church. Please phone me at home or leave a message at my Cornerstone Counselling Centre office in two weeks and I will make arrangements to pick them up. Those participants who would like to receive a profile of their results will need to remember their own "Subject identification Number" to obtain their sealed envelope when they are returned to your office next February.

Thanks for your interest and support of this project.

Sincerely,

Dave W. Stensland, M.S.

APPENDIX F: Instructions for Subjects Receiving Standard Questionnaire Package

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Thank you for your interest in participating as a subject in this research. In so doing you are directly helping in the construction of a scale that is designed to reliably measure Christian lifestyle values.

2. Please read the "important directions for marking answers" found on the back of the blue answer sheets. Use only PENCILS labelled HB or No. 2.

3. The first sheet in your packet refers to general information about you (demographic information) that you fill in on the left half of Side 1 of your answer sheet. You will note that there is specific places to fill in information on sex, education, and your birth date. DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE ANSWER SHEETS. Your SUBJECT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER has already been assigned. Please fill it in on the answer sheets under the identification number columns A B C D E. The remaining information is to be filled in under the special codes section using columns K L M N O P.

4. In a scale of this kind it is very easy to inadvertently respond to the items in ways that you think you **ought** to think or behave rather than in ways that you **actually** think and behave. Therefore, in order to assist you to respond realistically, you are encouraged to recall a **recent actual life situation of your own** that fits the item before choosing your answer.

5. Please complete all 200 items in the Christian Lifestyle Inventory and return the questions with your answer sheet to the church office.

6. Thank you for your valuable assistance on this project.

APPENDIX G: Instructions for Subjects Receiving Extra Questionnaire Package

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Thank you for your interest in participating as a subject in this research. In so doing you are directly helping in the construction of a scale that is designed to reliably measure Christian lifestyle values.

2. Please read the "important directions for marking answers" found on the back of the blue answer sheets. Use only PENCILS labelled HB or No. 2.

3. The first sheet in your packet refers to general information about you (demographic information) that you fill in on the left half of Side 1 of both answer sheets. You will note that there is specific places to fill in information on sex, education, and your birth date. DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE ANSWER SHEETS. Your SUBJECT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER has already been assigned. Please fill it in on the answer sheets under the identification number columns A B C D E. The remaining information is to be filled in under the special codes section using columns K L M N O P.

4. In a scale of this kind it is very easy to inadvertently respond to the items in ways that you think you **ought** to think or behave rather than in ways that you **actually** think and behave. Therefore, in order to assist you to respond realistically, you are encouraged to recall a **recent actual life situation of your own** that fits the item before choosing your answer. Please complete all 200 items in the Christian Lifestyle Inventory.

5. Congratulations! Every fifth subject gets to do an extra questionnaire called "Insight" and you are one of the lucky ones.

   For each of the 125 items, choose the one phrase that best describes your priorities at this time and fill it in on answer sheet # 2. By priorities we mean the choices most representative of your present situation, not choices you prefer. Do not choose any phrase you do not clearly understand. If two sentences are equally applicable, choose the one that is a priority in your behavior today. The one you do not choose will probably occur again. Choose "E" only if none of the items is applicable or understandable, not if you have difficulty choosing between responses. Persons experiencing a major change in their lives should answer the questions as they apply to the present situation.

6. Please return the questionnaires with your answer sheets to the church office when you are finished.

7. Thank you for your valuable assistance on this project.

APPENDIX H: *Insight* Items

Pages 268 to 279 have been removed due to copyright restrictions. The items from a values inventory entitled Insight (Hall, 1990) were on these pages.

PAGINATION ERROR.

TEXT COMPLETE.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA.

CANADIAN THESES SERVICE.

ERREUR DE PAGINATION.

LE TEXTE EST COMPLET.

BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA.

SERVICE DES THESES CANADIENNES.

APPENDIX I: Tables

Table 1 Distribution Of Expert Pastor Judges By Denomination

Denomination	Number
Anglican	1
Baptist	3
Catholic	1
Christian & Missionary Alliance	1
Christian Reformed	1
Evangelical Free	1
Lutheran	2
Pentecostal	1
United	1
Total	12

TABLE 2 Expert Item Judgement Agreement With Item Key

Judge	Number of Items In agreement With Key	Percentage of Items In Agreement With Key
1	154	65.5
2	111	47.2
3	138	58.7
4	135	57.4
5	153	65.1
6	133	56.6
7	135	57.4
8	120	51.1
9	95	40.4
10	99	42.1
11	116	49.4
12	77	32.8
Range	77 - 154	32.8 - 65.5
Mean	122.1	52.0

TABLE 3 Church Participation Rates By Denomination

	Number Contacted	Number Participated	Participation Rate
Anglican	6	3	50.0
Baptist	9	8	88.9
Catholic	7	7	100.0
Alliance	7	5	71.4
Reformed	5	4	80.0
Evan Free	6	4	66.7
Lutheran	7	5	71.4
Pentecostal	7	4	57.1
United	14	10	71.4
Total	68	50	73.5

TABLE 4 Subject Return Rates By Denomination

	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Number Spoiled	Return Rate
Anglican	80	58	1	72.5
Baptist	164	135	0	82.3
Catholic	134	90	1	67.2
Alliance	48	41	0	85.4
Reformed	72	58	1	80.6
Evan Free	44	30	0	68.2
Lutheran	130	95	3	73.1
Pentecostal	170	103	4	60.6
United	100	74	1	74.0
Other	14	13	0	92.9
Total	956	697	11	72.9

TABLE 5 Subject Distribution By Denomination

	Number	Percent
Anglican	57	8.3
Baptist	135	19.7
Catholic	89	13.0
Alliance	41	6.0
Reformed	57	8.3
Evan Free	30	4.4
Lutheran	92	13.4
Pentecostal	99	14.4
United	73	10.6
Other	13	1.9
Total	686	100.0

TABLE 6 Age distribution By Denomination

	Range	Mean	Median
Anglican	23 - 71	46.6	47.0
Baptist	22 - 78	43.4	41.0
Catholic	21 - 67	44.5	43.0
Alliance	18 - 51	37.4	39.0
Reformed	17 - 74	38.2	36.5
Evan Free	23 - 55	33.2	32.0
Lutheran	23 - 80	46.4	44.0
Pentecostal	19 - 77	37.3	35.0
United	19 - 81	52.2	52.0
Other	24 - 52	36.9	42.0
Total	17 - 81	43.0	42.0

TABLE 7 Percent of Sex Distribution By Denomination

	Unrecorded	Female	Male
Anglican	3.5	62.4	35.1
Baptist	5.2	63.0	31.9
Catholic	3.4	67.4	29.2
Alliance	0.0	53.7	46.3
Reformed	3.5	50.9	45.6
Evan Free	6.7	56.7	36.7
Lutheran	5.4	70.7	23.9
Pentecostal	1.0	56.6	42.4
United	2.7	72.6	24.7
Other	0.0	53.8	46.2
Total	3.5	62.5	34.0

TABLE 8 Percent of Marital Status Distribution By Denomination

	Unrecorded	Single	Married	Widow(ed)	Separated	Divorced	Common Law
Anglican	3.5	12.3	70.2	1.8	3.5	8.8	0.0
Baptist	2.2	17.8	69.6	5.2	2.2	3.0	0.0
Catholic	2.2	13.5	71.9	1.1	5.6	4.5	1.1
Alliance	0.0	12.2	85.4	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0
Reformed	1.8	15.8	80.7	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Evan Free	0.0	26.7	70.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0
Lutheran	0.0	8.7	77.2	5.4	3.3	4.3	1.1
Pentecostal	6.1	19.2	67.7	2.0	1.0	4.0	0.0
United	1.4	2.7	80.8	12.3	0.0	2.7	0.0
Other	0.0	7.7	84.6	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Total	2.2	13.8	74.1	3.8	2.2	3.6	0.3

TABLE 9 Percent of Occupational Status Distribution By Denomination

Key:
0 = Other
1 = Professional, Doctor, Lawyer, Executive
2 = Other Professional, Manager, Teacher, Nurse
3 = Skilled and Building Trades, Farmer
4 = Sales, Technician, Clerical
5 = Laborer, Factory worker, Waitress
6 = General Service Employee
7 = Homemaker
8 = Student
9 = Unemployed

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Anglican	3.6	18.2	38.2	1.8	20.0	1.8	1.8	14.0	0.0	0.0
Baptist	5.3	9.8	26.5	7.6	13.3	1.5	0.8	28.8	5.3	0.8
Catholic	9.2	9.2	31.0	2.3	18.4	1.1	4.6	21.8	2.3	0.0
Alliance	0.0	9.8	26.8	12.2	24.4	7.3	0.0	14.6	4.9	0.0
Reformed	1.8	5.5	29.1	10.9	9.1	3.6	0.0	29.1	10.9	0.0
Ev Free	0.0	16.7	50.0	3.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.3	0.0
Lutheran	6.6	4.4	28.6	4.4	18.7	2.2	1.1	31.9	0.0	2.2
Pentecos	6.5	4.3	23.7	15.1	20.4	2.2	5.4	18.3	3.2	1.1
United	11.0	8.2	23.3	11.0	20.5	0.0	1.4	20.5	1.4	2.7
Other	7.7	7.7	61.5	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Total	5.8	8.7	29.6	7.6	17.6	1.9	1.9	22.5	3.4	0.9

Note: Unrecorded = 2.3 percent

TABLE 10 Percent of Income Distribution By Denomination

Key:
1 = $0 -$19,999
2 = 20,000 - 39,999
3 = 40,000 - 59,999
4 = $60,000 - $79,999
5 = 80,000+
? = unrecorded

	1	2	3	4	5	?
Anglican	21.1	33.3	22.8	7.0	7.0	8.8
Baptist	37.8	31.1	16.3	4.4	5.2	5.2
Catholic	34.8	27.0	21.3	6.7	3.4	6.7
Alliance	36.6	41.5	14.6	2.4	2.4	2.4
Reformed	28.1	42.1	19.3	1.8	3.5	5.3
Evan Free	33.3	43.3	3.3	10.0	3.3	6.7
Lutheran	35.9	35.9	12.0	4.3	3.3	8.6
Pentecostal	33.3	39.4	12.1	4.0	2.0	9.1
United	34.2	49.3	13.7	0.0	1.4	1.4
Other	46.2	38.5	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7
Total	33.8	36.7	15.3	4.4	3.5	6.3

TABLE 11 Frequency of Monthly Church Attendance By Denomination

	mean	median	mode
Anglican	5.9	6.0	4.0
Baptist	7.2	8.0	9.0
Catholic	6.3	6.0	9.0
Alliance	7.3	8.0	9.0
Reformed	8.0	9.0	9.0
Evan Free	6.5	7.0	9.0
Lutheran	6.1	6.0	4.0
Pentecostal	7.4	8.0	9.0
United	6.2	6.0	9.0
Other	5.1	4.0	4.0
Total	6.7	8.0	9.0

TABLE 12 Percent of Education Completed By Denomination

	1 - 12 Years	13 - 15 Years	16+ Years
Anglican	31.4	9.8	58.8
Baptist	36.4	29.7	33.9
Catholic	50.6	24.1	25.3
Alliance	55.0	20.0	25.0
Reformed	51.9	28.8	19.2
Evan Free	17.9	28.6	53.6
Lutheran	45.7	21.0	33.3
Pentecostal	55.6	25.6	18.9
United	52.9	19.1	27.9
Other	23.1	23.1	53.8
Total	45.0	23.5	31.5

TABLE 13 Communality Values For Desirability Subscale

Item	Value
5	.20
16	.17
27	.14
38	.36
49	.07
60	.15
71	.16
82	.14
93	.39
104	.25

TABLE 14 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Final Items And The Subscales

Key:
Go = Goodness
F = Faithfulness
Ge = Gentleness
SC = Self-Control
L = Love
J = Joy
Pe = Peace
Pa = Patience
K = Kindness

	Subscales								
Items	Go	F	Ge	SC	L	J	Pe	Pa	K
				GOODNESS ITEMS					
1	.61					.20			.31
12	.50			.20	.22				
23	.43								
34	.47			.20					
45	.46		.24		.22	.21			.37
56	.38		.22						
78	.46								
89	.54				.26				.37
129	.60		.29	.21	.35	.21			.53
138	.47				.31				
156	.36		.21		.30	.22	.23	.20	
165	.44	.24	.25			.22			.30
174	.54				.21				
183	.44								
192	.55		.23		.35	.21			.35
				FAITHFULNESS ITEMS					
13		.35	.20			.25	.27		.20
24		.51		.25					
35		.49		.35		.21	.25		
46		.54	.33			.29	.21	.22	.33
57		.58	.21	.27		.25	.22		
68		.59	.22	.28		.23	.25		
90		.47	.24			.26			.33
101		.47							
112	.28	.50	.30		.22	.31	.26		.42
121		.60	.24	.30		.25			.34
130		.55		.25		.22	.26		
139	.22	.39	.28	.25		.34	.30	.25	
148		.57	.38		.24	.35	.23	.25	.38
166		.51	.28	.36		.26	.34		
184		.51	.28		.24	.22			.31
193		.55	.34	.21	.28	.33	.33	.22	.26
				GENTLENESS ITEMS					
14			.35		.21	.27	.29	.35	
36	.26		.57		.27	.29	.29	.25	.33
47	.22	.32	.52	.27		.41	.43	.23	.27
58			.35						

						Subscales			
Items	Go	F	Ge	SC	L	J	Pe	Pa	K
69			.49			.24			
*73			.45			.24			.25
91	.20		.38			.35		.21	
*107		.29	.48			.34	.28	.30	.21
113	.22	.23	.46	.26		.39	.34	.41	
122		.30	.45		.38	.21		.25	.39
*125		.29	.55			.39	.23	.22	.34
140		.29	.41	.25	.22	.23	.24	.28	.24
149			.47		.24	.22		.24	.28
158		.25	.39		.25	.21		.20	.21
*160	.24	.28	.51		.34	.33	.23	.23	.36
167		.39	.53			.32	.22	.22	.36
176		.22	.45		.31	21		.30	.36
185	.22	.28	.45		.21	.21		.26	.29
194		.24	.43		.21	.29	.27	.25	
				SELF CONTROL ITEMS					
4		.27		.54		.34	.42	.22	
15		.23		.53		.23	.35	.24	
26				.50					
37	.20	.33		.61		.26	.31		.21
48		.22		.52					
59				.46					
70		.27		.49					
81				.47					
92				.41					
103		.24		.52			.25		
114		.21		.48			.25		
123		.29		.53		.20	.28		
132		.22		.58		.23	.35		
150		.35	.22	.67		.29	.37		
159		.27	.20	.55			.26		
195		.39		.50		.22	.25		
				LOVE ITEMS					
6		.22	.26	.20	.48				.22
17			.27		.31				
39	.33				.46				.23
50	.24		.30		.45	.21		.30	.32
61	.21	.21	.23		.37				.26
72	.27		.33		.48			.23	.48
83					.37	.25	.32		
94					.52				
105					.48				
115					.45				
133					.41				

						Subscales			
Items	Go	F	Ge	SC	L	J	Pe	Pa	K
151		.25	.36		.48	.23		.26	.36
169	.21	.22	.27	.23	.35	.25	.30	.23	.22
187	.20		.22		.42				.24
196					.40				
JOY ITEMS									
7	.20	.23	.33		.21	.63	.39	.33	
29			.22			.43		.24	.28
40	.27	.25	.33			.58	.35	.25	.26
62		.25	.26		.21	.45	.29	.24	.26
84	.25	.33	.45	.29		.68	.64	.35	.25
95	.27	.34	.40			.54	.28	.25	.41
106		.21		.38		.47	.45		
116		.38	.26			.39	.24		.22
134		.24	.30		.24	.34			.27
143		.24	.43			.48	.25		.25
152		.21	.35			.42	.20		
161		.25	.26			.48	.42		
170		.25	.31			.65	.46	.25	
179		.25	.29	.27		.56	.43	.37	.21
188		.33	.35	.30	.21	.57	.48	.31	
197		.35	.36	.26		.66	.61	.27	
PEACE ITEMS									
8			.20			.37	.52	.27	
19				.25		.39	.57	.27	
41				.25		.24	.53		
*51		.27	.36	.24		.41	.58	.20	
52		.30		.27		.36	.52		
63	.24	.30	.28	.32		.45	.60	.26	.21
85		.24	.33	.26		.49	.57	.26	.22
*102	.27	.36	.35	.35		.53	.68	.24	
126			.34			.41	.53	.39	
135		.29	.29	.33		.37	.61	.27	
144		.29	.38	.25	.24	.36	.48	.26	.20
153			.22			.33	.43	.20	
162	.32	.27	.26	.29		.38	.52	.24	.28
171		.34	.32	.37	.20	.50	.68	.21	
*177	.20	.37	.31	.43	.21	.39	.61	.22	.21
180	.24	.32	.25	.35		.37	.58		
189		.27	.28	.20	.22	.41	.55		
198		.40	.32	.30		.44	.55	.26	.21
PATIENCE ITEMS									
9			.22	.22		.20	.26	.46	
20					.22		.28	.43	

						Subscales			
Items	Go	F	Ge	SC	L	J	Pe	Pa	K
31								.40	
42								.52	
75								.37	
86			.38		.25	.25		.43	.30
97			.23			.24		.44	.28
108		.22	.25		.23			.46	
118			.25			.26		.59	.24
127	.22		.29		.24	.26		.40	.31
136			.24			.26	.22	.52	
145		.21	.29			.29	.25	.51	.23
154	.21	.24	.34			.35	.32	.48	.24
163			.27					.40	
172								.37	
181		.26	.28	.22	.26	.26	.30	.49	
*186			.32	.25		.34	.32	.51	
190			.38			.39	.22	.51	.22
199								.47	
				KINDNESS ITEMS					
*2	.22	.27	.42		.30	.25			.52
21			.28		.30				.55
32	.33	.36	.36		.29	.31		.24	.64
43	.37		.32		.30			.21	.58
54				.23					.45
87	.34	.22	.40		.45	.22		.27	.61
109	.28	.29	.34		.33	.27		.20	.64
119	.31	.20			.24				.48
128	.28	.37	.41		.31	.30	.21	.23	.73
137	.27	.28	.28		.23	.21		.27	.57
146	.27	.21	.31		.33	.28	.21	.21	.52
155	.28	.43	.24	.22		.29			.56
164	.39		.29		.32	.24		.21	.64
182	.25	.33	.41	.22	.39	.28	.23		.54
191	.21	.26	.26			.29			.60
200		.23	.26		.21			.25	.36

* Re-keyed items
Note: all keyed correlations were significant beyond p.001

TABLE 15 Alpha Levels For Christian Lifestyle Inventory Subscales and Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale

Scale	Alpha
Goodness	.76
Faithfulness	.80
Gentleness	.78
Self Control	.82
Love	.68
Joy	.82
Peace	.87
Patience	.79
Kindness	.85
Desirability	.28
Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale	.79

TABLE 16 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Subscales

Key:

Go = Goodness
F = Faithfulness
Ge = Gentleness
SC = Self-Control
L = Love
J = Joy
Pe = Peace
Pa = Patience
K = Kindness
D = Desirability

	Subscales									
	Go	F	Ge	SC	L	J	Pe	Pa	K	D
Go	1.00									
F	.28	1.00								
Ge	.36	.47	1.00							
SC	.25	.46	.29	1.00						
L	.45	.34	.46	.24	1.00					
J	.34	.50	.60	.36	.32	1.00				
Pe	.28	.47	.48	.50	.27	.71	1.00			
Pa	.20	.29	.51	.25	.38	.45	.42	1.00		
K	.48	.44	.54	.22	.50	.41	.25	.34	1.00	
D	.08	.07	.25	.07	.20	.19	.12	.31	.22	1.00

TABLE 17 Principal Components-Oblimin Rotation Factor Correlation Matrix

	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	1.00								
2	.11	1.00							
3	.24	.07	1.00						
4	.18	.18	.17	1.00					
5	.09	.09	.09	.03	1.00				
6	.23	.17	.10	.15	.08	1.00			
7	.08	.19	.07	.11	.01	.09	1.00		
8	.02	.11	.05	.08	.10	.12	.03	1.00	
9	.18	.22	.04	.20	.10	.18	.08	.09	1.00

TABLE 18 Principal Components Varimax Rotation Factor Loadings

	Factors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
					GOODNESS ITEMS				
1		.32						.50	
12					.24			.46	
23								.42	
34					.20			.40	.24
45		.39						.35	
56								.26	
78								.42	
89		.40						.36	
129		.56						.36	
138								.42	
156							.33	.28	
165		.24	.24					.31	
174								.46	
183								.46	
192		.36					.29	.34	
					FAITHFULNESS ITEMS				
13	.25								
24			.38		.25				
35			.23		.37				
46			.47			.26			
57			.51		.22				
68			.50		.21				
90		.23	.43						
101			.41						
112		.33	.47						−.23
121		.26	.58		.22				
130	.22		.47						
139	.22		.28	.24					
148		.23	.54			.25			
166	.28		.23		.33				
184			.47						
193	.24		.46				.25		
					GENTLENESS ITEMS				
14	.25			.31			.21		
36	.27	.37				.33			
47	.33					.38			
58	.21	.33	−.27						
69	.20	.21				.31			
73						.50			
91				.26		.30		.28	
107	.20			.27		.25			
113	.25			.49					−.22
122		.28	.22			.34			.23

	Factors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
125		.25				.58			
140			.21	.27	.21				
149		.24				.33	.22		
158						.31	.30		
160						.39			.32
167		.22	.33			.47			
176		.28		.22		.22	.21		
185			.26						.25
194						.39	.22		
SELF CONTROL ITEMS									
4	.35				.38				
15	.31				.40				
26					.44				
37	.24				.52				-.20
48					.50				
59					.39		.20		
70			.24		.44				
81					.52				
92					.40				
103					.49				.23
114					.44				
123	.23				.46				-.21
132	.29				.51				
150			.25		.57				
159					.54				
195			.40		.42				
LOVE ITEMS									
6							.32		
17						.40			
39								.39	.23
50		.22		.28			.22		
61		.20				.21			.21
72		.44					.28		
83	.37						.24		
94							.40	.23	
105							.46		
115							.41	.23	
133							.38		
151		.33					.39		
169	.29						.32		
187							.19		
196							.29		
JOY ITEMS									
7	.42			.25		.23			
29		.23		.28					

	Factors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
40	.33			.20		.26		.29	
62	.24								.42
84	.63					.24			
95		.33				.30			
106	.46				.25				-.23
116			.43						
134		.21				.25	.23		
143	.24					.53			
152						.42		.22	
161	.49								
170	.51					.24			
179	.38			.42					
188	.44					.24			
197	.64								
				PEACE ITEMS					
8	.50								
19	.58								
41	.48								
51	.56								
52	.50								
63	.53								
85	.51								.25
102	.62								
126	.50			.26					
135	.50								
144	.37					.30	.22		
153	.35						-.22		
162	.43	.24						.23	
171	.62								
177	.46				.35				
180	.49				.20				
189	.51								
198	.45		.30						.33
				PATIENCE ITEMS					
9	.21			.36					
20	.26			.21			.31		
31				.25			.35	-.31	
42				.55					
75				.26			.31		
86				.34		.27			.26
97		.22		.48					
108				.32			.30		.21
118				.56					
127		.30		.32					
136				.44					
145				.38					

	Factors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
154	.23			.39					.26
163				.35					.27
172				.33					
181	.23			.32			.30		
186	.21			.53					
190				.50		.31			
199				.46					
KINDNESS ITEMS									
2		.44				.34			
21		.52							
32		.56	.27						
43		.56							
54		.38							
87		.52				.21	.23		
109		.59	.22						
119		.42							
128		.68	.25						
137		.48	.25	.26					
146		.42							
155		.52	.43						
164		.61							
182		.42				.21	.26		
191		.56							
200		.22	.22						.39

Table 19 Mean Scores And Standard Deviations On The Christian Lifestyle Inventory
(N = 686)

Subscale	Mean	SD
Goodness	3.3892	.5274
Faithfulness	4.2126	.3931
Gentleness	3.7597	.4136
Self Control	3.3666	.6061
Love	3.7847	.4294
Joy	3.7841	.4935
Peace	3.7131	.6012
Patience	3.5855	.4380
Kindness	3.7342	.5459
Total	3.6993	.3353

Table 20 Mean Score Differences On Faithfulness Subscale By Sex

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	.8750	5.8314	.0160
Within Groups	660	.1501		

Group	N	Mean	S.D.
Female	429	4.2465*	.3690
Male	233	4.1704*	.4191

* significant at .05 level

Table 21 Mean Score Differences On Gentleness Subscale By Sex

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1.2577	7.5554	.0061
Within Groups	660	.1665		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Female	429	3.8047*	.3884
Male	233	3.7134*	.4419

* significant at .05 level

Table 22 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Sex

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	4.0089	22.7880	.0000
Within Groups	660	.1759		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Female	429	3.8441*	.4079
Male	233	3.6811*	.4400

* significant at .05 level

Table 23 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Sex

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1.7440	4.9135	.0270
Within Groups	660	.3550		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Female	429	3.6694*	.6006
Male	233	3.7768*	.5868

* significant at .05 level

Table 24 Mean Score Differences On Kindness Subscale By Sex

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	6.2918	21.9549	.0000
Within Groups	660	.2866		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Female	429	3.8103*	.5105
Male	233	3.6062*	.5783

* significant at .05 level

Table 25 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Age

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	6	2.9357	11.3803	.0000
Within Groups	616	.2580		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	2	1	3	4	5	6	7
2 (20 - 29)	79	2.9916	.5615	2							
1 (19 or less)	8	3.1500	.7143	1							
3 (30 - 39)	190	3.3283	.5353	3	*						
4 (40 - 49)	171	3.4212	.4714	4	*						
5 (50 - 59)	94	3.5045	.4884	5	*						
6 (60 - 69)	55	3.5677	.4659	6	*						
7 (70 plus)	26	3.5927	.4432	7	*						

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 26 Mean Score Differences On Self-Control Subscale By Age

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	6	2.6032	7.4709	.0000
Within Groups	616	.3484		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 (19 or less)	8	3.0703	.4994	1							
2 (20 - 29)	79	3.1533	.6584	2							
3 (30 - 39)	190	3.2605	.6084	3							
4 (40 - 49)	171	3.3788	.6227	4							
5 (50 - 59)	94	3.4818	.5355	5		*					
7 (70 plus)	26	3.6668	.4563	7		*					
6 (60 - 69)	55	3.6848	.4580	6		*	*				

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 27 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Age

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	6	1.3464	5.9561	.0000
Within Groups	616	.2261		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	3	2	4	6	1	5	7
3 (30 - 39)	190	3.6444	.4750	3							
2 (20 - 29)	79	3.6646	.5807	2							
4 (40 - 49)	171	3.7650	.4926	4							
6 (60 - 69)	55	3.8311	.4211	6							
1 (19 or less)	8	3.9063	.4037	1							
5 (50 - 59)	94	3.9247	.4140	5	*	*					
7 (70 plus)	26	4.0245	.3096	7	*						

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 28 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Age

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	6	1.4633	5.1827	.0004
Within Groups	616	.3498		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	2	3	4	1	6	7	5
2 (20 - 29)	79	3.5795	.7356	2							
3 (30 - 39)	190	3.6069	.5875	3							
4 (40 - 49)	171	3.7170	.5688	4							
1 (19 or less)	8	3.7569	.4464	1							
6 (60 - 69)	55	3.8122	.5489	6							
7 (70 plus)	26	3.9044	.5782	7							
5 (50 - 59)	94	3.9120	.5392	5	*	*					

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 29 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Age

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	6	.7196	6.9465	.0000
Within Groups	616	.1036		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	2	3	1	4	5	6	7
2 (20 - 29)	79	3.5746	.3672	2							
3 (30 - 39)	190	3.6368	.3088	3							
1 (19 or less)	8	3.6818	.2852	1							
4 (40 - 49)	171	3.7201	.3225	4							
5 (50 - 59)	94	3.7937	.3246	5	*	*					
6 (60 - 69)	55	3.8071	.3207	6	*						
7 (70 plus)	26	3.8740	.2580	7	*						

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 30 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Education

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	2.0126	7.3011	.0007
Within Groups	617	.2757		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences			
					1	2	3
1 (1 - 12 yrs)	279	3.2929	.5103	1			
2 (13 - 15 yrs)	146	3.3602	.5773	2			
3 (16+ yrs)	195	3.4799	.5045	3	*		

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 31 Mean Score Differences On Faithfulness Subscale By Education

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.5898	3.9479	.0198
Within Groups	617	.1494		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences			
					1	2	3
1 (1 - 12 yrs)	279	4.1744	.4053	1			
2 (13 - 15 yrs)	146	4.2551	.3550	2			
3 (16+ yrs)	195	4.2666	.3815	3	*		

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 32 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Education

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1.0683	5.9895	.0027
Within Groups	617	.1784		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	1	2	3
1 (1 - 12 yrs)	279	3.7289	.4099	1			
2 (13 - 15 yrs)	146	3.8046	.4137	2			
3 (16+ yrs)	195	3.8638	.4456	3	*		

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 33 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Education

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	.3635	3.2870	.0380
Within Groups	617	.1106		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	1	2	3
1 (1 - 12 yrs)	279	3.6630	.3291	1			
2 (13 - 15 yrs)	146	3.7070	.3403	2			
3 (16+ yrs)	195	3.7417	.3317	3	*		

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 34 Mean Score Differences On Gentleness Subscale By Marital Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	5	.3750	2.2836	.0449
Within Groups	665	.1642		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences						
					3	0	1	2	4	5
3 Separated	15	3.6316	.4636	3						
0 Single	95	3.6698	.4330	0						
1 Married	508	3.7740	.4002	1						
2 Widowed	26	3.8357	.2984	2						
4 Divorced	25	3.8977	.4584	4						
5 Common Law	2	4.0263	.2605	5						

Note: No two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 35 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Marital Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	5	.7626	3.2580	.0065
Within Groups	665	.2341		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences						
					3	5	0	1	4	2
3 Separated	15	3.4792	.4651	3						
5 Common Law	2	3.6250	.0000	5						
0 Single	95	3.6400	.5114	0						
1 Married	508	3.7578	.4782	1						
4 Divorced	25	3.8429	.6138	4						
2 Widowed	26	3.9732	.3489	2						

Note: No two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 36 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Marital Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	5	2.0538	7.6780	.0000
Within Groups	665	.2675		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences						
					3	0	1	4	5	2
3 Separated	15	3.0756	.5967	3						
0 Single	95	3.1298	.6009	0						
1 Married	508	3.4105	.4988	1		*				
4 Divorced	25	3.4968	.4945	4						
5 Common Law	2	3.5000	.9899	5						
2 Widowed	26	3.6639	.4877	2	*	*				

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 37 Mean Score Differences On Self-Control Subscale By Marital Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	5	2.0123	5.7047	.0000
Within Groups	665	.3528		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences						
					0	3	1	4	5	2
0 Single	95	3.0974	.5956	0						
3 Separated	15	3.2208	.6512	3						
1 Married	508	3.4015	.5907	1	*					
4 Divorced	25	3.4832	.6290	4						
5 Common Law	2	3.6250	.3536	5						
2 Widowed	26	3.6270	.5917	2	*					

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 38 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Marital Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	5	.4484	7.5104	.0290
Within Groups	665	.1786		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences						
					0	5	1	3	2	4
0 Single	95	3.7116	.4513	0						
5 Common Law	2	3.7333	.7542	5						
1 Married	508	3.7823	.4194	1						
3 Separated	15	3.8000	.5474	3						
2 Widowed	26	3.8333	.3468	2						
4 Divorced	25	4.0425	.3346	4	*					

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 39 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Marital Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	5	1.5260	4.4655	.0005
Within Groups	665	.3417		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences						
					3	0	4	1	2	5
3 Separated	15	3.2407	.6121	3						
0 Single	95	3.5569	.6069	0						
4 Divorced	25	3.5788	.7337	4						
1 Married	508	3.7556	.5722	1	*					
2 Widowed	26	3.8538	.5783	2						
5 Common Law	2	3.9167	.3536	5						

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 40 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Marital Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	5	.5645	5.4431	.0001
Within Groups	665	.1037		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences						
					3	0	1	5	4	2
3 Separated	15	3.5685	.2733	3						
0 Single	95	3.5701	.3471	0						
1 Married	508	3.7132	.3184	1		*				
5 Common Law	2	3.8016	.3372	5						
4 Divorced	25	3.8192	.3447	4		*				
2 Widowed	26	3.8381	.2995	2		*				

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 41 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Family Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	8.5767	31.9165	.0000
Within Groups	663	.2687		

Group	N	Mean	SD
No Children	152	3.1653*	.5743
Children	513	3.4358*	.5007

* significant at .05 level

Table 42 Mean Score Differences On Faithfulness Subscale By Family Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1.2558	8.4424	.0038
Within Groups	663	.1487		

Group	N	Mean	SD
No Children	152	4.1402*	.4208
Children	513	4.2437*	.3747

* significant at .05 level

Table 43 Mean Score Differences On Gentleness Subscale By Family Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	190716	6.4671	.0112
Within Groups	663	.1657		

Group	N	Mean	SD
No Children	152	3.6888*	.4514
Children	513	3.7844*	.3930

* significant at .05 level

Table 44 Mean Score Differences On Self-Control Subscale By Family Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	7.6630	21.6215	.0000
Within Groups	663	.3544		

Group	N	Mean	SD
No Children	152	3.1692*	.6258
Children	513	3.4248*	.5860

* significant at .05 level

Table 45 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Family Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	5.6606	24.4223	.0000
Within Groups	663	.2318		

Group	N	Mean	SD
No Children	152	3.5775*	.5478
Children	513	3.7972*	.4600

* significant at .05 level

Table 46 Mean Score Differences On Peace subscale By Family Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	8.2596	24.2324	.0000
Within Groups	663	.3409		

Group	N	Mean	SD
No Children	152	3.5068*	.6605
Children	513	3.7722*	.5592

* significant at .05 level

Table 47 Mean Score Differences On Kindness Subscale By Family Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	1.6072	5.6606	.0176
Within Groups	663	.2839		

Group	N	Mean	SD
No Children	152	3.6419*	.5473
Children	513	3.7590*	.5285

* significant at .05 level

Table 48 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Family Status

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	3.0645	29.6390	.0000
Within Groups	663	.1034		

Group	N	Mean	SD
No Children	152	3.5730*	.3501
Children	513	3.7347*	.3126

* significant at .05 level

Table 49 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Gross Annual Income

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.8897	3.1999	.0129
Within Groups	638	.2780		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	1	2	3	4	5
1 ($0-19,999)	232	3.3025	.5763	1					
2 ($20,000-39,000)	252	3.3649	.5094	2					
3 ($40,000-59,999)	105	3.4561	.4802	3					
4 ($60,000-79,999)	30	3.5043	.4661	4					
5 ($80,000+)	24	3.5917	.4780	5					

Note: No two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 50 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Gross Annual Income

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.0294	4.4602	.0015
Within Groups	638	.2308		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	1	2	3	4	5
1 ($0-19,999)	232	3.6531	.4827	1					
2 ($20,000-39,000)	252	3.7802	.4948	2					
3 ($40,000-59,999)	105	3.8296	.4736	3	*				
4 ($60,000-79,999)	30	3.8757	.4555	4					
5 ($80,000+)	24	3.9043	.3386	5					

Note: pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 51 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Gross Annual Income

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.5655	4.5981	.0011
Within Groups	638	.3405		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences					
					1	3	2	5	4
1 ($0-19,999)	232	3.5976	.5926	1					
3 ($40,000-59,999)	105	3.7468	.5800	3					
2 ($20,000-39,000)	252	3.7632	.5969	2	*				
5 ($80,000+)	24	3.8102	.4557	5					
4 ($60,000-79,999)	30	3.9833	.4876	4	*				

Note: pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 52 Mean Score Differences On Self-Control Subscale By Occupational Group

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	9	.8693	2.3861	.0116
Within Groups	660	.3643		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences										
					8	4	6	9	0	7	2	5	3	1
8 Student	23	2.9783	.6704	8										
4 Sales, Tech, Cler	118	3.2236	.6847	4										
6 General Service	13	3.2404	.5630	6										
9 Unemployed	6	3.3410	.7271	9										
0 Other	39	3.3558	.4905	0										
7 Homemaker	151	3.3915	.6091	7										
2 Other Profession	198	3.4216	.5627	2										
5 Laborer, Waitress	13	3.4279	.6021	5										
3 Skilled Trades	51	3.4476	.5987	3										
1 Professional	58	3.4731	.5899	1										

Note: no two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 53 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Occupational Group

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	9	.4757	2.6934	.0044
Within Groups	660	.1766		

Group	N	Mean	SD		Group Differences									
					5	3	6	8	4	9	0	7	1	2
5 Laborer, Waitress	13	3.5077	.6138	5										
3 Skilled Trades	51	3.6346	.3927	3										
6 General Service	13	3.6872	.4229	6										
8 Student	23	3.7014	.5179	8										
4 Sales, Tech, Cler	118	3.7144	.4089	4										
9 Unemployed	6	3.7540	.2438	9										
0 Other	39	3.7726	.4384	0										
7 Homemaker	151	3.8350	.3874	7										
1 Professional	58	3.8368	.4851	1										
2 Other Profession	198	3.8450	.4106	2										

Note: no two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 54 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Occupational Group

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	9	1.0989	3.2168	.0008
Within Groups	660	.3416		

Group	N	Mean	SD		Group Differences									
					5	6	8	4	9	0	7	2	1	3
5 Laborer, Waitress	13	3.3462	.5720	5										
6 General Service	13	3.4573	.7824	6										
8 Student	23	3.5676	.6025	8										
4 Sales, Tech, Cler	118	3.5832	.6324	4										
9 Unemployed	6	3.6204	.5560	9										
0 Other	39	3.6557	.5065	0										
7 Homemaker	151	3.6789	.5637	7										
2 Other Profession	198	3.7999	.5765	2										
1 Professional	58	3.8333	.5231	1										
3 Skilled Trades	51	3.9172	.6226	3										

Note: no two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 55 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Occupational Group

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	9	.2533	2.3913	.0114
Within Groups	660	.1059		

Group	N	Mean	SD		Group Differences									
					5	6	8	4	9	0	7	3	2	1
5 Laborer, Waitress	13	3.5401	.3615	5										
6 General Service	13	3.5442	.4458	6										
8 Student	23	3.5679	.3718	8										
4 Sales, Tech, Cler	118	3.6284	.3407	4										
9 Unemployed	6	3.6700	.1245	9										
0 Other	39	3.7022	.2549	0										
7 Homemaker	151	3.7139	.3132	7										
3 Skilled Trades	51	3.7253	.3429	3										
2 Other Profession	198	3.7312	.3216	2										
1 Professional	58	3.7797	.3195	1										

Note: no two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 56 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Occupational Group

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	9	1.3674	5.1569	.0000
Within Groups	660	.2652		

Group	N	Mean	SD		Group Differences									
					6	5	4	9	8	3	2	0	7	1
6 General Service	13	3.0103	.7343	6										
5 Laborer, Waitress	13	3.1026	.9352	5										
4 Sales, Tech, Cler	118	3.1795	.5275	4										
9 Unemployed	6	3.2667	.5215	9										
8 Student	23	3.2944	.5990	8										
3 Skilled Trades	51	3.3713	.4786	3										
2 Other Profession	198	3.4138	.4935	2										
0 Other	39	3.4216	.4714	0										
7 Homemaker	151	3.4359	.5014	7										
1 Professional	58	3.6356	.4324	1			*							

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 57 Mean Score Differences On Goodness Subscale By Denomination

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	8	1.4305	5.4328	.0000
Within Groups	622	.2633		

Group	N	Mean	SD		Group Differences								
					4	6	8	2	7	3	5	9	1
4 Alliance	41	3.0943	.5042	4									
6 Evan. Free	29	3.1954	.4767	6									
8 Pentecostal	63	3.3045	.5690	8									
2 Baptist	134	3.3305	.5372	2									
7 Lutheran	92	3.3757	.5131	7									
3 Catholic	87	3.3869	.5315	3									
5 Reformed	56	3.5190	.5893	5	*								
9 United	73	3.5666	.4040	9	*								
1 Anglican	56	3.6054	.4197	1	*								

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 58 Mean Score Differences On Love Subscale By Denomination

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	8	1.0372	5.9823	.0000
Within Groups	622	.1734		

Group	N	Mean	SD		Group Differences								
					6	4	8	5	7	2	3	9	1
6 Evan. Free	29	3.5011	.4513	6									
4 Alliance	41	3.5772	.4345	4									
8 Pentecostal	63	3.6757	.4138	8									
5 Reformed	56	3.7631	.4152	5									
7 Lutheran	92	3.7739	.4161	7									
2 Baptist	134	3.7984	.4244	2									
3 Catholic	87	3.8411	.3943	3									
9 United	73	3.8909	.4183	9	*								
1 Anglican	56	3.9870	.3999	1	*	*	*						

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 59 Mean Score Differences On Gentleness Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.4600	2.8112	.0247
Within Groups	660	.1636		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences					
					3	2	1	4	5
3 (4 - 6)	108	3.7107	.4123	3					
2 (2 - 3)	131	3.7119	.4164	2					
1 (1 or less)	35	3.7504	.4961	1					
4 (7 - 8)	156	3.7548	.3592	4					
5 (9 or more)	235	3.8344	.4077	5					

Note: No two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 60 Mean Score Differences On Patience Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.6036	3.1527	.0139
Within Groups	660	.1914		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences					
					3	1	2	4	5
3 (4 - 6)	108	3.4866	.4100	3					
1 (1 or less)	35	3.5353	.4546	1					
2 (2 - 3)	131	3.5365	.4754	2					
4 (7 - 8)	156	3.6221	.4355	4					
5 (9 or more)	235	3.6418	.4265	5					

Note: No two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 61 Mean Score Differences On Kindness Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.7671	2.7261	.0285
Within Groups	660	.2814		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences					
					4	2	3	1	5
4 (7 - 8)	156	3.6680	.5543	4					
2 (2 - 3)	131	3.6746	.4807	2					
3 (4 - 6)	108	3.7125	.5416	3					
1 (1 or less)	35	3.7125	.5424	1					
5 (9 or more)	235	3.8230	.5337	5					

Note: No two groups were significantly different at .05 level

Table 62 Mean Score Differences On Joy Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.8091	3.4362	.0086
Within Groups	660	.2355		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences					
					1	4	3	2	5
1 (1 or less)	35	3.6131	.6256	1					
4 (7 - 8)	156	3.6653	.4927	4					
3 (4 - 6)	108	3.7413	.4829	3					
2 (2 - 3)	131	3.7533	.4903	2					
5 (9 or more)	235	3.8286	.4542	5		*			

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 63 Mean Score Differences On Peace Subscale By Frequency Of Church Attendance

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	1.7677	5.1423	.0004
Within Groups	660	.3437		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences					
					1	2	3	4	5
1 (1 or less)	35	3.4611	.6996	1					
2 (2 - 3)	131	3.6435	.6465	2					
3 (4 - 6)	108	3.6747	.5653	3					
4 (7 - 8)	156	3.6789	.5689	4					
5 (9 or more)	235	3.8416	.5529	5	*	*			

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 64 Mean Score Differences On Total Scale By Frequency Of Church Attendance

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	.5003	4.7658	.0009
Within Groups	660	.1050		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences					
					1	3	2	4	5
1 (1 or less)	35	3.6120	.4141	1					
3 (4 - 6)	108	3.6586	.3308	3					
2 (2 - 3)	131	3.6661	.3242	2					
4 (7 - 8)	156	3.6681	.3138	4					
5 (9 or more)	235	3.7725	.3123	5				*	

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

TABLE 65 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Christian Lifestyle Inventory and The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale

Scale	Pearson r
Goodness	.12
Faithfulness	.21
Gentleness	.23
Self Control	.13
Love	.13
Joy	.24
Peace	.28
Patience	.25
Kindness	.18
Total	.29

TABLE 66 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Christian Lifestyle Inventory and The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale By Denomination

Denomination	Pearson r
Evan Free	.49
Baptist	.46
Anglican	.45
Alliance	.44
Pentecostal	.34
Catholic	.32
Reformed	.29
United	.28
Lutheran	.27

Note: All were significant beyond p.05 level.

Table 67 Mean Score Differences On The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale By Denomination

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	8	3.2003	10.9927	.0000
Within Groups	622	.2911		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences									
					9	3	1	7	2	5	6	4	8
9 United	73	3.7107	.6537	9									
3 Catholic	87	3.9368	.6033	3									
1 Anglican	56	4.1784	.5564	1	*								
7 Lutheran	92	4.2062	.5331	7	*								
2 Baptist	134	4.2333	.5158	2	*	*							
5 Reformed	56	4.2821	.4605	5	*								
6 Evan. Free	29	4.2897	.5199	6	*								
4 Alliance	41	4.2951	.4577	4	*								
8 Pentecostal	63	4.3984	.4602	8	*	*							

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 68 Mean Score Differences On The Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale By Frequency Of Monthly Church Attendance

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	4	8.1130	29.1045	.0000
Within Groups	620	.2788		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences	1	2	3	4	5
1 (1 or less)	18	3.6074	.7784	1					
2 (2 - 3)	41	3.7049	.7668	2					
3 (4 - 6)	142	3.9652	.6063	3					
4 (7 - 8)	85	4.0315	.5204	4	*	*			
5 (9 or more)	339	4.3458	.4366	5	*	*	*	*	

* pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

TABLE 69 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Christian Lifestyle Inventory And Insight

Scale	Pearson r
Goodness	.32
Faithfulness	.07
Gentleness	.12
Self Control	.09
Love	.20
Joy	.11
Peace	.10
Patience	-.04
Kindness	.20
Total	.20

TABLE 70 Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients Between The Christian Lifestyle Inventory and *Insight* By Denomination

Denomination	N	Pearson r	*p*
Evan Free	4	.39	.307
Baptist	24	.29	.088
Anglican	8	-.33	.210
Alliance	7	.35	.220
Pentecostal	9	-.24	.266
Catholic	18	.38	.059
Reformed	11	.13	.352
United	13	.12	.350
Lutheran	16	.24	.181

Note: None were significant beyond p.05 level.

Table 71 Mean Score Differences On *Insight* By Education

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	5.6480	4.4792	.0135
Within Groups	107	1.2610		

Group	N	Mean	SD	Group Differences			
					1	2	3
1 (1 - 12 yrs)	52	8.8269	.8794	1			
2 (13 - 15 yrs)	22	9.1364	1.4572	2			
3 (16+ yrs)	36	9.5556	1.2058	3	*		

* denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level

Table 72 Mean Score Differences On *Insight* By Occupational Group

	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	9	2.9421	2.1648	.0300
Within Groups	108	1.3590		

Group	N	Mean	SD		Group Differences									
					5	6	9	0	4	7	2	8	3	1
5 Laborer, Waitress	3	7.6667	.5774	5										
6 General Service	1	8.0000	.0000	6										
9 Unemployed	2	8.5000	.7071	9										
0 Other	9	8.7778	1.2019	0										
4 Sales, Tech, Cler	23	8.8696	1.2175	4										
7 Homemaker	23	8.9130	.9493	7										
2 Other Profession	32	9.3438	1.3586	2										
8 Student	5	9.4000	.5477	8										
3 Skilled Trades	3	9.6000	1.1402	3										
1 Professional	15	10.0000	1.1339	1										

Note: No two groups were significantly different at .05 level